

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature
52nd Day

Friday, April 6, 1973.

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

QUESTIONS

CARTER REPORT

Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden): — Before the Orders of the Day, a question of the Hon. Attorney General.

Some weeks ago you advised this House that you expected the Carter Report on the Disposition of Legal Services in the near future at that particular time. Have you now received that Report?

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I am advised that the chairman of the Report, Dean Carter, will be making a public statement with respect to the Report some time early in the week, Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday of next week. We shall have received the Report officially at that time.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

HUMBOLDT CHAMPIONSHIP – SASKATCHEWAN JUNIOR HOCKEY LEAGUE

Hon. E.L. Mr. Tchorzewski (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the House an item of importance and of interest to Saskatchewan as well, as I am sure to most of the Members of this House. While we were sitting here last night, going through the business of this House, the Humboldt Broncos won the Saskatchewan Junior Hockey League Championship in Estevan.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The Humboldt Broncos defeated Estevan by a score of 9 to 2. Previous to that they had defeated Melville and the powerful Prince Albert Raiders who were overwhelmed by Humboldt even though they finished in first place in the Northern Division of the league. This is quite an achievement for the Humboldt team in that it is only their third year in the league and in two of those three years, the last two years, they have been the provincial champions. I know that we in this House as well as all of the hockey fans in Saskatchewan will be looking forward to their accomplishments as they proceed to play against the Portage La Prairie hockey team in the Saskatchewan-Manitoba playdowns.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

LAND BANK LEASE FORMS

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, before the

Orders of the Day I wonder if I could direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

We are interested, and I am sure all MLAs and all people are interested, in the lease form being used when land is leased from the Land Bank. I contacted the Commission, I believe it was Wednesday, day before yesterday and was informed that the lease forms were not yet available. I wonder if this was correct information. Are the long-term lease forms available that are going to be used, or are being used, for leasing land or are they not yet available?

Hon. J.R. Mr. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, the lease form, the long-term lease forms for leasing of Land Bank land as far as the Department of Agriculture is concerned have been ready for some time. Because of the kind of lease and the guarantee of transfer of offspring from the lessee to the other, we wanted to make certain that there are no problems in those lease forms. We, therefore, asked the Attorney General to scrutinize them very closely. His Department is now endeavoring to do that and I am told that they will be coming out of the Attorney General's Department in the very near future. There will be no problems or complications in regard to signing up these leases before the crop year is under way.

Mr. Gardner: — A supplementary question. I had handed to me yesterday a form which says it is a Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission Long-Term Agricultural Lease. I am just wondering if these are in the hands of the general public or are supposed to be distributed and if this is actually the lease that will be used? I will be glad to have this duplicated and give the Minister a copy.

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate if the Member would have one duplicated so I can, in fact, see if it is a true lease form of the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission. To my knowledge we have not made the leases available to the general public. We do not wish to until we are certain the lease is correct in every way possible. We will be awaiting that approval from the Attorney General, as I said earlier, which will be coming in the very near future.

CARTER REPORT

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, just before the Orders of the Day I wonder if I might make one other additional comment in response to the Member from Lumsden's question about the Carter Commission.

If my memory serves me correctly, I believe that Dean Carter will be making this public on Wednesday of this coming week. We have had a report now for two or three days, sort of in unofficial terms, to be quite candid about the whole operation. We will view it officially once Dean Carter announces it and elaborates on his propositions. I think that is the best approach rather than doing it from our own Department.

ANNOUNCEMENT

BRITISH COLUMBIA COAST PILOTS SETTLE

Mr. Romanow: — I rise on another point, Mr. Speaker, I think of some interest to the people of Saskatchewan. It relates to the matter of transportation.

Members will know that there was a British Columbia Coast Pilots' — I don't know whether to call it strike, slowdown or dispute. The Government of Saskatchewan, of course, being landlocked and being very vitally interested in transportation movement, particularly to the West Coast ports and finding increasing business in traffic, we were interested and made representations. I received a telegram today. The Premier received a telegram today, which I should like to read to the Members, from Mr. A. McKinnon, President, British Columbia Coast Pilots Limited:

Membership of British Columbia Coast Pilots wish to express appreciation of your interest and concern in progress of our contract negotiations with the Pacific Pilotage Authority. Throughout, our prime concern has been safety of shipping and the Canadian economy. I am pleased to report that the Coast Pilots and the Pacific Pilotage Authority have reached agreement in principle on the contract effective April 4, 1973.

Now that is good news, indeed, not only settling the strike, but for farmers and the Western Canadian economy. Again, I think that we can take some small credit to the extent that at least the matter was highlighted and the urgency was brought to the attention of all concerned, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

LAND BANK LEASE FORMS

Mr. D.F. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Agriculture, what type of lease form has been used up 'til now for Land Bank leases?

Mr. Messer: — No lease form.

Mr. MacDonald: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I was at a public meeting last night at Lipton and a Mr. Philips told me that he had sold his land to the Land Bank and his son-in-law had signed a lease for the Land Bank and used a lease for a loan at the bank. I told Mr. Philips I didn't understand what he was talking about but he said he had. I wonder what form of lease he could have presented to the bank.

Mr. Messer: — He would have presented a guarantee of a lease.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 7 — Old Age Security and Guaranteed Income Supplement Increase

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Mostoway (Hanley):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Canada to proceed immediately with legislation to implement a program which includes the following:

1. An increase in the Old Age Security pension to \$125 per month.
2. The Guaranteed Income Supplement be increased so that the combined Old Age Security pension and the Guaranteed Income Supplement would provide the single pensioner with a guaranteed income of \$225 a month and a married couple of \$375 a month.

And the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Boldt:

That all the words after the word “Assembly” be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

“recommend to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan to proceed immediately with legislation to implement a program which includes the following:

1. A \$25.00 per month pension to all Saskatchewan Old Age Security recipients.
2. A Provincial Guaranteed Income Supplement to be added on to the Federal Supplement to guarantee a single pensioner with an income of \$225.00 a month and a married couple of \$375.00 a month.”

Mr. D.M. McPherson (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, we won't stand everything, we will just get on with the business of the House. I should just like to say, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) is away because he is moving to a new constituency, so you will all be happy about that.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment that is before the House by the Hon. Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) I believe is a good one and deserves the support of every Member of this House. Let us take a look at what the amendment states. First the new scheme will guarantee \$225 for every single person in Saskatchewan 65 years and over, including the Federal Income Supplement and the provincial income. It will also give a married couple of 65 years and over a pension of \$375 including the Income Supplement. Mr. Speaker, as Members of the Legislature we should be looking after those people who have reached the golden years and need these old age pensions to give them the proper care and attention. The Federal Government has seen fit to raise the old age pensions in the recent budget for those 65 years and over as well as the Income Supplement. I sincerely believe there is not a man in this House who does not approve of the step taken by the Hon.

April 6, 1973

John Turner in his recent budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — In seconding this amendment I should like to express to this House that I think that we should go further than the federal plan and bring the pension to a guaranteed \$225 for a single person and \$375 for a married couple.

The number of old age pensioners in the province is taken from the statistics and there are 97,821 male and female residents in the Province of Saskatchewan who participate in the plan. With the increased moneys that we are receiving from Ottawa the older people in this province can be looked after, I believe, the way they should be. We should each examine ourselves and help those pioneers who have worked hard all their lives to build this great province. The extra help could bring them the extras they so richly deserve. The NDP Government is continually crying to Ottawa to subsidize this scheme or that scheme, never saying let's do this ourselves. Surely for once, Mr. Speaker, we can take it upon ourselves the task of aiding senior citizens of this province and giving them the additional moneys they need. Ottawa has moved, it is time the NDP Government to your right, Mr. Speaker, kept their promise for a New Deal for People and gave the older citizens of this province some help.

If we examine and review the history of the Old Age Pension, Mr. Speaker, in 1962 the pension was \$70. It was raised in 1963 to \$75 at 70 years of age; in 1965 it was changed to \$75 at 65 years; in 1970 it was raised to \$80 age 65 and in 1973 it was raised to \$100 at age 65. The Income Supplement has gone up since 1966 from \$30 to \$70 and it is \$70 in 1973. Now the single person with a guaranteed supplement receives \$175 while a married couple with a guaranteed supplement receives \$325. With these amendments that I should like to see passed, the single person will receive \$225 and a married couple will receive \$375.

This is a good amendment, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure the senior citizens from all over Saskatchewan are looking forward to enjoying their retirement and their golden years in happiness knowing that they have enough money to purchase the necessities of life. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that all Members would support this excellent amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to comment briefly on some of the items raised by the Members opposite. I can only suggest that the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt), in his amendment, was either being facetious, deliberately opposite to the truth, or he was totally ignorant of the facts. It could have been both. He made a number of comments regarding the fact that he didn't believe in universality, so it doesn't create that kind of difficulty for me. He went on to say that thousands of Canadians are on good pensions and not in need of additional pensions. Now, Mr. Speaker, Statistics Canada shows us that half the senior citizens in this country are living below the poverty line. That's hardly on good pensions, at least the way I read it. He said it was quite common to find persons who were receiving pensions of \$500 to \$1,000 a month. It may be

common among his friends, but certainly not common among mine.

He also suggested that — and this was something that bothered me — the means test today, he said, is a very simple matter. He went on to suggest that inspectors would be unnecessary. No means test is really a simple matter; it just can't operate that way. An income test is a simple matter, or can be, but a means test takes into account a number of different items, items not just including income, but a person's assets at the time. When he talks about the great things the Federal Government has done, let me tell the House of some of our attempts regarding the means test with the Federal Government. We have, on more than one occasion, asked the Federal Government to increase the asset allowance. In the case of one class of people we wanted to raise the assets allowable to \$5,000 so that if they had \$50,000 or less in the bank we could still provide them with assistance. The Federal Government said, No, not at \$5,000. Well good thing, says the Member opposite, maybe it is, but as long as you believe in a means test these are the things, the items that we have to use. It doesn't make it simple to administer.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of reference has been made in this debate by some of the Members opposite, at least, to the question of British Columbia and what it has done. I want to join the Members in commending the New Democratic Government of British Columbia for providing assistance to their senior citizens. The Members opposite say if they can do it we can do it. Let's look at the facts.

Under the so-called free enterprise government that British Columbia suffered for some years, they spent very little on social security and social services. Indeed, with the new budget just announced by the Government of British Columbia, announced just a few weeks ago, they increased their social service costs by \$90 million, which incidentally is more than our total budget for social services. But in doing so, they just came, at this point, to 13 per cent of their budget for social services. We are already and have been for over one year at 12.8 per cent of the budget for Social Services here in Saskatchewan. The plain fact of the matter is we got there a long time before British Columbia did and we got there because we have had a New Democratic Government far longer than the Province of British Columbia has.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, again referring to British Columbia, some Members, maybe mistakenly although I thought I had cleared up this impression once before, some Members have said that if we institute such a program provincially we'll get cost-sharing from Ottawa. This is just not true. Ottawa has said to the Province of British Columbia — and I checked this again in telephone conversations with them — Ottawa has said there is no way in which they will cost-share an increase in the pensions if it is considered on an income test or on a universality basis. They will include it only with a straight means test, which we already have under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan for those in need. So this cannot be done as simply as is stated.

Now the Member who just finished speaking referred to

Mr. Turner's step and that all Members of the House would approve this step. We do. I think we are all very happy that Mr. Turner took some step, even though it was a very short one, and maybe taken by a rather near-sighted man, stumbling along the way. It amounts, Mr. Speaker, to something just over an 11 per cent increase for senior citizens over a two-year period when the cost of living has gone up. The 11 per cent increase wouldn't have been quite so bad if even two years ago the present pension had been acceptable and had provided a decent standard of living, which it didn't, and which it doesn't do today. The 11 per cent increase on top of a decent pension might have been acceptable, but on top of the pension, the base that was already there, we just don't believe that it was good enough.

The amounts referred to in the motion and in the amendment would mean that senior citizens would be getting approximately 25 per cent above the poverty line established by the Economic Council of Canada and adjusted to bring it up to date. I am sure that the Members of this House would feel that this is not too much to be expecting for our senior citizens, that they should receive 25 per cent above the poverty line in Canada. I want to suggest though, Mr. Speaker, that when the Member introduced his amendment he was attempting really to take away from the real need, and take away from the concept of providing just that kind of assistance. He knows as we all do, that the Federal Government is in the best possible position to provide the kind of tax shift that is necessary to shift the finances from the wealthy to the senior citizens who really need it. No province has the same ability as does the Federal Treasury in doing this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me mention just a few of the things that our Government has already done and compare them, if I may. In the last year of the Liberal administration here in Saskatchewan they provided under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan to senior citizens about \$4 million. This year we will provide \$7.6 million. In the last year of the Liberal administration they provided for senior citizens in Special Care Homes \$56,000, this year we shall provide over \$3 million. I remind you, Sir, there is only a two-year spread, a two-year time lag. The last year of the Liberal administration, Community Services for the Aged, they provided no dollars, this year we shall provide \$284,000. The Liberal administration collected from senior citizens about \$2 million in medical deterrent fees. They charged senior citizens \$3 million in medical care premiums, which we, of course, have abolished and did so quickly after assuming office. Construction grants for Special Care Homes have risen from \$453,000 in the fiscal year 1970-71 to \$705,000 in the year 1972-73. The block grants, of course, were introduced in the last month or in the month of May in 1971, they have now gone up for Special Care Homes to \$2.4 million.

Mr. Speaker, this Government has already done a great deal for senior citizens. The Federal Government has increased their income by 11 per cent. We, in two years, have increased our support to senior citizens by over 1,500 per cent and it seems to me this shows our intention and our concern. The total spent by the Liberals in their last year in office; if you deduct deterrent fees, and the premiums for medical care premiums was \$1.3 million for senior citizens in the Province of Saskatchewan. This coming year, not including new programs such as the Property Improvement Grant, Low Rental Housing, the House Repair Assistance Grant, we will be spending over \$20 million for these

same senior citizens.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — So, Mr. Speaker, I can only suggest that the amendment put forward by the Members opposite was put forward with at least some facetious intent, but it was also put forward in a tone of insincerity, in a tone of attempting to water down what we have been trying to do. Because of this, Mr. Speaker, I certainly intend to vote against the amendment but I shall support, very happily, the motion that was placed before us calling on the Government of Canada to implement the increases that are mentioned in the motion.

As has already been pointed out when Mr. Lalonde was here yesterday and had the opportunity of being introduced to the House, we were holding discussions on income security for Canadians. Pension security will continue to be part of these discussions. We will be meeting in Ottawa the last week in April as Federal-Provincial Ministers. Mr. Lalonde has indicated a willingness to discuss any aspects of income security and I would hope that this being the case that this Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan will support the motion and not the amendment, so that it can strengthen our case when we meet with our Federal counterpart in Ottawa.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the senior citizens of our province recognize what we have done, the assistance that we have provided. They recognize that we have been extending ourselves to do our best and they look for us to take their case to the Federal Government in Ottawa.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to on the following Recorded Division:

YEAS — 36

Messieurs

Dyck	Pepper	Taylor
Meakes	Michayluk	Matsalla
Wood	Byers	Richards
Smishek	Thorson	Faris
Romanow	Whelan	Gross
Messer	Kwasnica	Feduniak
Snyder	Carlson	Comer
Bowerman	Engel	Rolfes
Thibault	Owens	Lange
Kowalchuk	Robbins	Oliver
Brockelbank	Tchorzewski	Feschuk
MacMurchy	Cowley	Flasch

NAYS — 13

Messieurs

Steuart	Boldt	Lane
Coupland	MacDonald (Milestone)	MacDonald (Moose Jaw North)
Loken	McIsaac	Wiebe
Guy	Gardner	
Grant	McPherson	

Resolution No. 12 — Death of the Lakes in the Qu'Appelle Basin

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government that emergency action be taken to prevent the death of the lakes in the Qu'Appelle Basin: (a) by implementing immediately, the recommendations which the Qu'Appelle Basin Study Board feels will have a major impact on the management of land and water in the Qu'Appelle Basin and which should be implemented without delay, and (b) by giving immediate assistance to cities and town, particularly Moose Jaw and Regina, to provide for the treatment of waste.

And the proposed amendment thereto by the Hon. Mr. Byers (Minister of Environment):

That all the words after the word "Assembly" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

commends the Government of Saskatchewan: (a) for involving the public in its assessment of the Report of the Qu'Appelle Basin Study Report as recommended in Recommendation No. 53 of the Report; (b) for its endorsement in principle of the Framework Plan outlined in the Report, and (c) for proceeding with negotiations with the Government of Canada to secure its recognition of the broad regional and national benefits that would accrue from corrective programs in the Qu'Appelle.

Mr. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, in commenting on this Resolution, I think that there is some significance in the remarks of the Member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Hanson) when he spoke on this debate. He referred to the Resolution as a 'Motherhood' Resolution. The NDP attitude is that this issue of pollution is a motherhood issue. That means that they have to be careful what they say about the issue even though they are not prepared to accept their rightful responsibility. In calling this a motherhood issue they show their lack of concern. The Members opposite would indicate that there is not really a problem but they don't dare admit their feelings to the public, therefore they will treat this issue like motherhood.

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) has shown twice in Moose Jaw that he considers it a motherhood issue. A month or so ago he admitted that his Government had fulfilled some kind of a responsibility by simply receiving the Qu'Appelle Basin Study Report, and that by simply receiving the Report that was recommended by the former Liberal Government, he implied that this showed his Party's commitment to the problem of pollution. It showed nothing more than that the Minister of Labour is willing to treat the issue as a motherhood issue. The Minister of Labour and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) came to Moose Jaw in November, 1971, and at that time they proved that they were not prepared to take any action, they simply came to appear as if they were interested. They had no intention of taking positive steps. To this date they have taken none.

I should like to tell the Members opposite that this is not

a motherhood issue. We, on this side of the House, don't intend to let the House treat it in such a manner. The Government opposite and their CCF predecessors have the worst record in Canada on this issue and we intend to embarrass and force the Blakeney Government to get off their seats.

I was interested in the reaction of the Member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Hanson) when he talked about the way the Press had misinterpreted his statements and hadn't given him press coverage and so on. He cried and whined about the way the Press treated him. He didn't like the way they had covered his speech about the Melbourne project, the sewage irrigation project. Somewhere the Member has picked up an article or a journal and he has read about the Melbourne project and he thinks this is something new and exciting and different. I should like to tell the Member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley that the city of Moose Jaw has been studying sewage irrigation projects for at least five years. I was on city council in 1968 and we were discussing and investigating the possibility at that time, they still are and other people in the area have been doing it for some time. It is not a new and radical approach, it is something that we are very aware of. I don't think he has to be too upset because his remarks were ignored.

The Member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley said that his Government is not going to jump head first into the water before testing it. Let me tell the Member that this is good common sense. I will also tell him that he doesn't need to test the water before jumping in, it is already tested, and if he comes to Moose Jaw he will see a "Polluted, do not swim" sign on the Moose Jaw River that flows directly to the Qu'Appelle. It is polluted as it enters Moose Jaw and it is polluted as it leaves Moose Jaw and enters the Qu'Appelle. I don't blame Members opposite for not jumping head first. The fact is that no one is able to jump into our river and this is the point. Our Moose Jaw River is polluted, it is a putrid, stagnant body of water and we think it is time something is done. That is the reason we had the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Municipal Affairs come to Moose Jaw a year and a half ago. We, in Moose Jaw don't think it is a motherhood issue. Mr. Hanson, we don't think your Government should stick its head in our River, it is polluted, it is not fit. We want your Government to put its leadership into our river so that our people can swim in our very own river.

Another point that seemed very evident again in the remarks of the Members opposite, the Member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley when he spoke in this debate and that is the very obvious anti-city bias in the Blakeney Government. This obvious bias keeps showing itself in many Government measures. It quite simply shows that the NDP do not understand urban municipalities and apparently have no intention of trying to understand urban problems. Members opposite would attempt to make city people the villains for all the evils of our province. To this date the Government had indicated that they expect Regina and Moose Jaw to install tertiary treatment. We have no indication as to what other recommendations of the Report are to be implemented. It is fairly easy to point the finger at the two cities of Moose Jaw and Regina and tell them to get busy and then expect them to pay the large amount of expenses involved. We should remember that the bad condition of the Qu'Appelle Basin comes as a result of a hundred years of misuse and it comes as a result of inaction by governments for 60 years. I think that at this time in

history it is too much to expect the cities of Moose Jaw and Regina to absorb the extremely high cost of providing tertiary sewage treatment. This is a level of treatment that is not required by any other community in Saskatchewan and, in fact, it is more than is expected of any other city in Canada. The province is prepared to pay 10 per cent of this huge cost. This is not enough. The Government of Saskatchewan must assume more of a responsibility if they expect Moose Jaw to absorb what I consider to be an extraordinary cost. Moose Jaw has always been a leader in this province when it comes to taking its share of responsibility in the treatment of municipal sewage. Moose Jaw was providing secondary sewage treatment to its waste while the cities of Saskatoon and Prince Albert were dumping raw sewage into our rivers. By the time these two cities were forced to provide a level of treatment that Moose Jaw had provided for a number of years, we find that Government assistance is available, assistance that was not available when Moose Jaw instituted its facilities.

Moose Jaw again is being asked to be a leader, to take steps that are considered extraordinary, if we compare what other cities are expected to do. The measures that our city is being asked to institute are measures that will benefit the province as a whole. Because this can be termed an extraordinary expense and because it is a measure that will benefit the whole province I think it is fair for Moose Jaw to ask that the province pick up a larger and fairer share of the cost. It is my opinion that the people of Moose Jaw agree basically with the recommendations of the Qu'Appelle Basin Study. It is also my opinion that the people of Moose Jaw take seriously their responsibility and their obligation to provide for adequate sewage treatment. The Governments of Saskatchewan and Ottawa must show their good faith with the whole question of our environment and they must support recommendations of the Qu'Appelle Basin Report both with finances and with leadership.

I think that consideration should be given to establishing a Qu'Appelle Basin Authority similar to the Wascana Centre Authority in Regina. This Qu'Appelle Basin Authority could provide for the co-ordinated development of the valley and it would also co-ordinate the three levels of government as well as other concerned groups. A co-ordinated approach must be used, piecemeal attacks at the problem will not produce results, nor is a piecemeal approach a fair approach to the city of Moose, which will be asked to carry a very heavy financial burden which once again will fall on the property and the home owners.

Mr. Speaker, I support the motion but I will certainly not support the supercilious amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.H. Lange (Assiniboia-Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, I have a few words to say on the motion and amendment. I think that the points that have been raised by the Member from Moose Jaw North have been well taken and I would certainly support his stand in the matter. I should like to say, however, that in spite of the fact that there can be no doubt about the importance of cleaning up the Qu'Appelle Basin and in principle there can be nothing more important than a Bill that is related to the environment for study of the environment, that the economic study of the Qu'Appelle Basin leaves very much to be desired. The economic study was done by the

same individual who did the economic study for elevator rationalization in Saskatchewan and comes from the Department of Economics of the University of Saskatoon. The report talks about the decline of farms in the area and about the change of service-centre status and about population decrease. In other words it does not touch upon the real economics of the Qu'Appelle River Basin. It doesn't talk about forage or trucking or any other agricultural potential. It is merely a report that could have been done by you or me by simply using a Dun and Bradstreet report and the statistics from Statistics Canada.

It is not specific, especially in regard to the Qu'Appelle Basin itself. It doesn't touch on the economics of recreation or the potential for tourism in the Qu'Appelle Basin.

I think that when this Government implements the recommendations of the Qu'Appelle Basin Study, they should keep a very close eye upon the economics and consult people who know something about the Qu'Appelle Valley. I feel that the economic report of the Qu'Appelle Basin is extremely inadequate.

The only solution, of course, to cleaning up the Qu'Appelle Basin is to simply stop bio-nutrients from getting into the system.

With words of caution to the Government regarding economics, I would support the amendment and not the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, just a few comments in regard to the amendment.

The old saying goes that you had not intended in getting into this debate and it applies as well here. Then I heard the amendment that was moved to this motion.

Basically all the amendment is, is a pat on the back for the Government Members sitting opposite and it proves again that they are trying to hide under their sanctimonious attitude.

If one goes back to the 1971 general election, in which pollution and pollution problems in Saskatchewan were the top priority in their campaign when they were touring around this province, each and every candidate carried a small bottle of polluted water from the Prince Albert Pulp Mill, telling us how terrible it was up there, how much they were going to do to help correct it; the great things that they were going to do for pollution in this province. What have they done to correct pollution at the Prince Albert Pulp Mill? What have they done, I ask the Members opposite, what have you done to correct pollution at the Prince Albert Pulp Mill? Zero! You have done nothing. It was strictly a political campaigning issue.

So here again, Mr. Speaker, the Government has an opportunity to put money and energy where their mouth is, where they talked the entire summer. What are they doing? They are passing an amendment congratulating themselves for conducting the study. Well, who started the study? It was the Liberal Government that started the study, not the sanctimonious fellows on the other side of the House. Here we are giving them a chance by moving this Resolution to do something, to fill out one of

April 6, 1973

their promises and there again they come back and say, no, we are going to have further study and we are going to pat ourselves on the back for what we have done.

Mr. Speaker, it is nothing but hogwash. If they are concerned about the pollution problems in this province, why don't they do something about it?

With those brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that there is no way that I can support the amendment and I heartily endorse the Resolution that was moved.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Snyder (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, I want to make a small contribution to the debate on the Resolution that is before us, basically because I am joined with my colleagues on this side of the House, in a matter of mutual concern with respect to the matter revolving around water management, the whole question of our water resources and also because my constituency is directly affected by the recommendations of the Qu'Appelle Study Board.

The problems identified by the Study and their proposed solutions, I suggest merit the very careful consideration of all the Members of this Assembly. They merit the consideration of the Province of Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada and all elected municipal officials who have a stake in the whole matter of water resources and pollution control and the host of other problems that are identified with the Qu'Appelle Basin Study.

Mr. Speaker, the original resolution, either by accident or by design, and I expect by design, is narrow and restricted in its approach to the overall problem. The amendment which has been offered by the Minister of the Environment recognizes these restrictive features and accordingly the amendment is before us.

I just want to comment very briefly with respect to the comments of my colleague, the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) and I don't intend to engage in any verbal battle with him with respect to the Qu'Appelle Basin Study except to say that his attitude is one which has departed, I think, considerably from his earlier declaration of objectivity and impartiality and an attempt to present a point of view in this Legislature that was not based upon political lines.

I just ask him to reflect upon that period of time when Liberals occupied their seats on this side of the House and ask him if he can recall one instance where concern was registered by the Thatcher Government with respect to the problems created by pollution; no measures that were even considered in any vague way for the city of Moose Jaw or in other areas of the province.

I think the concern which the Member attempts to register at this stage is one which is hypocritical in the face of previous Liberal inaction.

There is another very important matter that I think has to be discussed and considered in light of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Qu'Appelle Basin Study has had an appendix added to it.

There is an extension of the Qu'Appelle Basin Study which Members should know about, which will be in our hands very shortly, which is related directly to the matter of the Moose Jaw River. I understand that that particular study will be released within a matter of a few weeks. It will be in our hands very shortly.

Mr. Speaker, the Study which is under discussion encompasses a broader range of topics relating to development and control of water and land resources in the Qu'Appelle Basin, much broader than probably would appear at first glance. The Report contains 64 recommendations dealing with such important subjects as water quality, water treatment, agricultural practices, water supply, flooding, land use, recreational development, wildlife management and so on. The major thrust of the far-reaching framework plan devised for the Qu'Appelle are directed towards the improvement of the quality of living of basin residents, the encouragement of agricultural and industrial growth, the provision of safeguards to health and property and the restoration of the natural attributes of the Qu'Appelle Valley.

Accordingly, a concentrated public education program is going to be necessary to make the people of Saskatchewan fully aware of the full implication of the study report and the remedial action which will be necessary to re-establish a proper balance of nature, Mr. Speaker.

It must also be realized that in focusing attention on the Qu'Appelle Basin we are not dealing with as narrowly defined an area as might be supposed. Within the 20,000 square miles of the Basin, live nearly one-third of our total population. The residents of each of the 104 communities and surrounding districts within this region, have a clear-cut responsibility to make the business of ecology their business.

I am especially interested, Mr. Speaker, in that portion of the report which attempts to come to grips with the question of water pollution. In this respect I share the concern implied in the Resolution introduced by the Hon. Member for Regina Albert Park.

We, in this part of Canada, Mr. Speaker, are becoming slowly and rather belatedly awakened to the fact that pollution is just not something to worry about at some time in the future. On the contrary it poses as a very serious and a very immediate threat to each of us.

It is shocking to learn, Mr. Speaker, for example, that the Fishing Lakes, that Pasqua, Echo, Mission and Katepwa are even more polluted than Lake Erie which is already regarded, and has been regarded for some time, as a dead body of water.

I think in total one cannot avoid the conclusion that the ecological chickens have come home to roost — for mankind in general and for the residents of southern Saskatchewan in particular. It is rarely possible to achieve a unanimity of views on anything on an international level, Mr. Speaker, but there was no division of opinion at the UNESCO meeting in Paris four years ago, when more than 250 experts from 50 countries agreed that in 20 years life on the planet earth would be showing the first signs of succumbing to pollution, that the atmosphere will be becoming unbreathable for man and for animals and that life will cease in our rivers and lakes and that the plants

April 6, 1973

will wither from atmospheric poisoning.

Now that is a pretty awesome kind of a spectacle to contemplate, the destruction of life, Mr. Speaker, which has been evolving for several millions of years. It is awesome to contemplate that it can be wiped out so quickly and so effectively by man's ignorance and carelessness. Nevertheless this appears to be so.

In a conservation sense then, the human tenants of this globe, Mr. Speaker, are busy emptying out the refrigerator for a glorious feast tonight without so much as a thought about the need for meals tomorrow.

Basically nature is an orderly system of things and events. A healthy and productive way of life requires a proper balance between unspoiled rural areas and built up cities, between plants and animals and human beings, between air and water and industry. Humans are just one part of that overall pattern. Yet man has been unwilling to recognize this fact. He has been too anxious to develop tools, to build cities to create a complex, technologically based society.

In doing so, he has been lured into a deadly illusion that expertise in matters of science make him independent of the laws of nature. It has been said that man is the only organism known that lives by destroying environment indispensable to his survival.

To this end, I suppose it may be said that we are entering into our own self destruction by the spreading of insecticides, without ascertaining the extent to which they may be fatal to birds, to beneficial insects and even to people.

We have poured millions of pounds of detergents into our rivers before discovering that they polluted our water. We have allowed our lakes to die of oxygen starvation, we have created deadly smog by floating noxious substances in the air.

It is apparent, Mr. Speaker, that we have reached a critical stage in human habitation. Conservation has become something more than that which a farmer does to grow more and better crops.

Now it must be regarded as an essential element of our hold on life. The natural order must be restored to protect ourselves and to leave it for those yet unborn, to leave something more than debts and depleted resources.

As Toffler suggested in his best seller, "Future Shock" new ways are needed to understand our environment to control technology and to provide an environmental screen which would ward off dangerous environmental intrusions before they actually develop.

This is my reading of the philosophy which is inherent in the Qu'Appelle Basin Report. Action is not only required to cure the ills which presently exist, but also to provide preventative measures for tomorrow. In specific terms, probably the recommendations attracting the most wide-spread attention, are those which centre upon the quality of water in the Qu'Appelle system, especially that of the Fishing Lakes.

The Report points out that the main concern relates to the growth of algae and aquatic weeds caused by an abundance of phosphorous, nitrogen and carbon, 70 per cent of which is due to effluent from the Moose Jaw and Regina sewage systems.

The Report, accordingly, asks that these two cities be required to provide a high level of waste treatment that includes the removal of phosphorous. I wholeheartedly subscribe to this view, Mr. Speaker, and I am in substantial agreement with the spirit of the Resolution in this regard. I am sure that it is an accurate reflection of the attitude of my constituents to say that the citizens of Moose Jaw are anxious to have this problem overcome because they are concerned about the impact of the Moose Jaw sewage system on other parts of the province, and also, they too, avail themselves of the facilities in the fishing and boating atmosphere, the hunting and other recreational activities which are supported by the Qu'Appelle River system.

The Report also refers to waste treatment at the Canadian Forces Base in Moose Jaw with regard to the improvement of the present sewage treatment system to eliminate the effluent problems relating to the Qu'Appelle system.

It is recommended that the Canadian Forces Base be required to provide an effluent which consistently meets the objectives established for federal facilities including nutrient removal.

I think it is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian Forces Base operations creates a significant difficulty within the confines of Moose Jaw itself. Sewage effluent from the Canadian Forces Base is discharged into the Moose Jaw River above the city and it flows down through River Park and through the city. The result is that recreational facilities established by Moose Jaw at the taxpayers' expense, including what is loosely referred to as the "new beach", are spoiled by pollution emanating from that particular source and this, I think, points up quite conclusively, Mr. Speaker, the need for federal involvement and the need for continuing discussions with federal officials relative to our needs in this particular connection.

The correction of the situation therefore involves not only factors of health in this particular case, but it also involves economic efficiency as well.

The Report offers two alternative methods for alleviating the pollution hazards from the Canadian Forces Base. The first would take the form of an improvement of the treatment system to provide for nutrient removal and improved removal of organic materials.

The other solution dependant upon the establishment of a tertiary treatment program by the city of Moose Jaw, would see waste from the Base piped to the Moose Jaw sewage plant, where it would then be treated and discharged below the city. As the Report observes the second alternative is more desirable because it would eliminate the discharge of effluent into the river above the city. And I am hopeful that this suggestion can be put into effect rather promptly.

It is hardly necessary, Mr. Speaker, to say that the Report and the recommendations related to the better development of sewage treatment in Moose Jaw and Regina, implies the

April 6, 1973

expenditure of a considerable sum of money, estimated to be from \$2 to \$3 per capita. In this connection the federal, provincial and municipal governments must be prepared, I suggest, to accept their rightful share of financial responsibilities attached to system modifications and in this connection the Provincial Government is not backing away from its particular responsibility.

It is encouraging to know that negotiations are under way between the Provincial and Federal Governments regarding some of the proposals contained in the Qu'Appelle Valley Report. Inasmuch as the measures advocated will be of national benefit, it is the position of the Government of Saskatchewan that major federal financial input is warranted. However, I was pleased to hear my colleague, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Byers) report on behalf of the Province that the Government will not delay in the taking of positive action before these negotiations are concluded. The Department of the Environment is currently discussing with the city of Moose Jaw the feasibility of a project of effluent irrigation. You have also heard the Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) in his Budget address indicate that a number of the proposals of the Qu'Appelle Basin Study will be dealt with in 1973-74 while others will be undergoing a more thorough evaluation. You may rest assured, Mr. Speaker, that the Qu'Appelle Basin Report is not going to be allowed by the Government of Saskatchewan to sit idly on a shelf to become a dust laden historical document, subject matter that is too vital to the social and economic welfare of this province to permit this to happen.

Ultimately, of course, it's the people of this province themselves who are going to be responsible for willingly and efficiently translating into action the plans envisaged by the Qu'Appelle Basin Study Board. It is very gratifying to see that the Report has attracted a great deal of serious attention throughout Saskatchewan. In the case of my own constituency renewed emphasis has been placed by public and private organizations, industrial firms, labor unions and individuals on matters like water quality, water supply, flood control and recreation, particularly in connection with the Moose Jaw River and Buffalo Pound Lake. Moose Jaw citizens are viewing the Report from a broader and a less parochial perspective as well as illustrated by the expressed interest of Moose Jaw City Council in joining the Qu'Appelle Valley Development Association.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close by adding my words of congratulations to the Qu'Appelle Study Board for their effort in preparing what I believe is a far-sighted imaginative report on this very real problem. It is a document which is meant to be read and it reads easily. It incorporates an appropriate blend of technical expertise and common sense. At the same time, unlike many official reports it's presented in a simple and well organized and understandable manner. It's gratifying to note that this Report is available to the public at a very inexpensive price and accordingly it will be readily available to large numbers of people. I think this is as it should be because the poisonous effects of pollution make no distinction between rich or poor as they resolutely squeeze the life from this small planet. I think it's the duty of all of our people to study the Report and share their reactions with the Government to assist us to devise strategies which will create in Saskatchewan a healthy natural environment for ourselves and for our children and for generations ahead.

I want at this time to indicate my support for the amendment which is before us, Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the original motion is restrictive in its approach to the overall problem and the amendment itself provides a more reasonable manner of associating ourselves in this Assembly with the problem which is before us.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Resolution No. 14 — Urges Government of Canada to reduce Unemployment

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Whelan (Regina North West):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Canada to develop adequate employment schemes to reduce unemployment in Canada to more acceptable proportions; to disclose details of works plans for the winter season at an early enough date to permit maximum participation at the provincial level, and to fulfil its responsibility, through its control of Canada's fiscal, monetary and general economic policies, to take action designed to provide long-term solutions to the problem of chronic unemployment in Canada.

And the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Lane:

That wherever the word "Canada" appears, it be deleted and the word "Saskatchewan" be substituted therefor, and that the word "municipal" be substituted for the word "provincial" in the fifth line thereof (Votes and Proceedings).

Mr. D.H. Lange (Assiniboia-Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, in re-introducing the unemployment resolution I should like to begin by quoting from the text of the address by J.L. Taylor who is chairman and president of Canada Trust. And in it in speaking about inflation and unemployment he says:

Chronic unemployment is a universal social problem of the '70s, a by-product everywhere of affluence and technology.

Well, this is not a particularly profound statement. It is absolutely true but in both his text and in other texts by major corporations they merely document the problem and they do not document solutions to unemployment.

I should like to try and relate unemployment to some of the trends that are inherent in our society both in Western Europe and more particularly in North America. I'd like to point out that we have a consumptive society which is based upon a system that thrives upon waste and obsolescence, a consumptive system which is directed toward the gullibility and vanity of the individual, and a consumptive system which is condoned by governments which don't plan for inevitable and predictable economic slumps. We have a questionable economic system which is fostering capitalist modes of production. These are based largely upon the law of supply and demand. Very often we hear about the law of supply and demand and it is straight-forward

and it simply means that supply is governed by the demand. But demand can be manipulated and it is manipulated by several techniques within our society. One of the major ones is salesmanship. We have tremendous forces of people who are consistently trying to convince the public to buy something which they may or may not need. Bay Street is totally composed of this sort of advertising agencies and promoters. They are consistently trying to convince women, for instance, that there is something hateful about growing old, that once you are past the age of 25 your husband no longer appreciates you unless you use a particular facial cream which makes him forget your age. Or that after 6,000 years of recorded history man all of a sudden has a dire need for colored bathroom tissue. It is very obvious to everyone that cars in our society are designed to wear out within two or three years and to be replaced in order to keep the economy cyclic.

A second major impetus into the economic system is that of government spending. Government spends many times on dysfunctional programs. Governments are the major stimulating input in a consumptive function. When there is a slump in the economy governments try to stimulate that particular sector of the economy in order to make the books balance in the gross national product. Most of the time governments spend on something which is of little or no value to society. In North America and in Canada, because it is very closely related to the United States, governments spend particularly on warfare needs. They do not feel that it is important to spend money on schools, hospitals, universities or day care centres, aid to senior citizens, impoverished groups or rat control. It's far, far more important to stimulate the economy by putting money into the military. If there is no government stimulus a slump occurs and this slump is predictable according to Keynes economics. Warfare in itself, we must remember, does not compete with the private sector to increase consumption. In fact, it subsidizes the private sector. The last Turner budget in Ottawa is an excellent example of this sort of stimulation. It is designed to give tax concessions to corporations. But will this stimulate the economy and is there any plan involved in it? The point is that government stimulus and salesmanship in themselves are not sufficient because the economy generates greater needs than both of these stimuli can satisfy. If we have more need than they can satisfy then we get greater production than consumption. When there is greater production than consumption, production must be cut back and when production is cut back unemployment occurs. Government is not particularly involved in programs like housing or transportation to the same extent that it is involved in industrialization of other aspect of the economy.

Now a government can carry on if it has three basic requirements. First it must have raw materials through resources. Secondly, investment opportunities abroad for its surplus capital. And thirdly, markets for its finished products. Now here, of course, is where the United States shines. It wants raw resources. It takes them from Saskatchewan, for instance, returns them to the United States. Meanwhile Saskatchewan provides investment opportunities for the United States. Then the United States finishes the raw materials and sells them back to Canada. That is how the economics of the United States keeps going in a cyclic process. The United States requires foreign economies to be able to meet all of the needs of a consumptive society. It has its foreign investments in Saskatchewan and it also draws its raw materials from Saskatchewan. But it leaves

Saskatchewan regionally depressed.

There are various ways that Saskatchewan might be able to get around the economics of unemployment problems. But we must remember that pulp mills are not a particularly labor intensive industry. There are few workers in a pulp mill vis-à-vis the wealth which is taken out. And there are few workers in an oil industry vis-à-vis the wealth that is taken out. As a result there is constant need for new construction of enterprises which are going to remove wealth. Consistent labor is found rather in processing industries and in the finishing manufacturing of products.

The Federal Government has tried to alleviate some of the problems which are associated with unemployment in regionally depressed areas of Canada through its various programs. Some of the federal agencies are evident to all of us. They consist of one acronym after another and they are designed to counter regional disparities. We have ADA, FRED, ADB, ARDA, DREE. But the total benefits from all of these programs have been far, far less than their costs. And we have some very disastrous monuments to document them. The Churchill Falls project in Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island's frozen fish plant, Manitoba's venture at Le Pas, the Nova Scotia heavy water plant, all projects of DREE, ARDA, FRED, ADA or ADB. Most of what these programs do is to stimulate the economy by pumping money in in one form or another.

But provinces' problems are not those of borrowing money. We, rather, lack the expertise, judgment, experience, and reliable services which constitute large corporations. Governments cannot take over an area of regional development through industrialization. They are hardly a match for sophisticated and experienced multi-national corporations. It is rather a matter of co-operating where possible and repatriating where necessary as in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Furthermore, governments cannot rely on private enterprise to relate to employment needs. Private enterprise locates around existing urban areas and creating employment opportunities in depressed areas is not an uppermost concern of either foreign or domestic entrepreneurs.

There are reasons why private corporations find it difficult to invest or to get along with governments. They have a preference, for instance, for certain modes of traditional financing, certain acceptable levels of risk in relation to expected normal returns on investment and they have a level of independence and internal control of decision-making which can't accommodate a government partner. These are the reasons why fly-by-nighters like Parsons and Whittemore will come to Saskatchewan but will not set up in a particularly highly urbanized area. If future projects carry with them no greater chances of success, we'd be better off to find another way to help stimulate unemployment in the province. Now here is where the Federal Government could help. They could exhibit a national policy and it could include Saskatchewan in it. The Trudeau example of federalism is nothing more than a gesture to do this.

Local people know best what they need. They don't require ratification from the "feds" and they don't need programs like DARE or CAP. All they need is a certain amount of monetary input and to be allowed to develop programs for themselves.

April 6, 1973

To try and relate the issue more to Saskatchewan I should like to point out that as well as blaming the Federal Government and trying to attain liaison between federal agencies and the Provincial Government, Saskatchewan is doing a great number of things to alleviate the unemployment problem. I think we should recognize that we cannot wait for others to solve our problems, that we must solve them for ourselves. We are doing this with, for instance, the FarmStart program. This will not, for a few years, have any effect on rural Saskatchewan, but what it may mean in a few years is that rather than a two and a half section farmer being merely restricted through lack of labor to operating only a grain enterprise, he may be able to diversify into hogs or poultry or cattle or fish or all of these things and by that process provide another family for each of the other enterprises. It is theoretically possible and certainly economically possible that on two and a half sections of farmland we could have five families, each one concerned with one aspect of grain farming, of fish farming, of poultry farming, of dairy farming, of feedlot farming, or perhaps hog farming. So rather than only having one person operating two and a half sections of land we would have as many as five or six families, possibly 30 people, thereby increasing population, increasing employment and perhaps, in the process, revitalizing rural Saskatchewan.

Integrated with this can be various housing programs which are particularly geared to the rural areas. Rural areas have all the amenities of urban areas plus privacy and still some fresh air.

I have already documented what I think should happen with the transportation system and although that speech may have been somewhat facetious there was far, far more in it than a hinterland dandy like Lorne Harasen could appreciate.

I think, furthermore, that Saskatchewan could investigate the possibilities of secondary processing industries which may be related to potash or to oil or to production of paper. These could be associated with major plants which we already have in operation in Saskatchewan, not the least of which is IPSCO, or plastic plants or wire and cable plants. Furthermore, Saskatchewan should provide more assistance to entrepreneurial ventures. There are many, many people who have ideas about business, about how to change the technological façade of society but do not have any economic means by which to carry out their ideas. There is no reason why the Provincial Government couldn't take a small chance on an individual who wishes to be an entrepreneur in the technological field the same way the Government is taking a chance on an individual in the Land Bank. As well, the Saskatchewan Government could be looking into diversifications into the plastics industry and into the electronics industry. These are two industries which require very little freight transportation and which are extremely labor intensive and capital restrictive. As well, we could look into other areas of farm diversification. We could look into co-operatives, into meat processing as we have begun, into grain storage, and into machinery manufacture. In these ways the Saskatchewan economy could be stimulated and in the process the unemployment problem could be alleviated.

Many people will cite Saskatchewan as a regionally depressed and disparaged area not capable of supporting industrialization. I should like to use my imagination for a moment if I can and point out what Saskatchewan can do by looking at a major world

problem. Rather than taking a small problem which is associated only to Saskatchewan I should like to cite one which is going to effect and is effecting the world presently. Let's look outside the Chamber to see what the biggest problem which is confronting society. Strangely enough we find that it isn't the Hog Marketing Commission nor is it the Land Bank, FarmStart, Teachers' Salary Bargaining or The University Act. Furthermore, the biggest problems confronting society is not the war in Vietnam it is not Nixonomics, it is not the future of the Canadian dollar or the future of the international monetary exchange. Of course, all of these are things of which we must be cognizant but as serious as some of these problems may be they are utterly dwarfed beside the magnitude of the problem of pollution. This has been somewhat documented by the Member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Snyder) a few moments ago.

The problem of pollution is so grave that if it does not assume priority amongst governments of the world we will not have to worry about any of the other problems. As a matter of fact, it is so grave that if governments do not assume pollution as the major priority, governments and indeed the world has less than a half a century left. Everyone is aware of some aspect of pollution, but let's document a few of the less parochial world phenomena. Let's assume for a moment that it is unimportant that the United States by the year 2,000 will have 300 to 500 square miles of garbage one mile deep most of which will be composed of plastics which take 200 to 500 years to decompose since we have presently not been using bio-degradable containers. Further, let's assume for a moment that it doesn't matter that by the year 2,000 there will be a constant mechanical hum around the world at about 70 decibel rating caused simply from sympathetic harmonic vibrations from mechanical vibrations by mechanical devices the world around. Let's assume further that the mass neurosis that is caused by this noise level amongst the human race is also unimportant.

Instead to relate the problem of pollution to employment and more particularly to Saskatchewan and further to the Government, let's look at a problem far, far more serious than either of these. Thor Heyerdahl said ten years ago on his trip across the ocean that the ocean was strewn with garbage from one end to the other and that he was in a veritable oil slick. Jacques Cousteau has recently stated that the oceans have less than one year before they are totally stagnant. The oceans, as you know, are the world's major producer of oxygen. The second major producer of oxygen are, of course, forests and they are being very quickly depleted through the lumbering industry. Furthermore, this year the United States experienced its first shortage of fuel oil for heat and presently the United States is rationing gasoline in Miami. And yet, of course, it still insists that it has enough gasoline.

We have two problems, a lack of oxygen caused by stagnant ocean to start with, by lack of forests secondly. And we have another problem which is aggravating the first one, that is the consumption of hydrocarbons in society. It is an ecological problem related to fuel consumption. Fuel consumption, further, is causing what is known as a greenhouse effect around the world. Carbon dioxide, water vapor and nitrogenous compounds which all come out of exhausts from hydrocarbons which are burned in internal combustion motors are presently collecting in the ionosphere. They are causing a vapor all the way around the world which does not allow ultra-violet rays to get through.

April 6, 1973

Most of us are aware that ultra violet produces ozone which is absolutely essential to life. Furthermore, this greenhouse effect is causing infra-red energy to remain on the inside of the earth rather than going back out into space. This is causing the temperature of the atmosphere to rise by several degrees per year. This is causing the polar ice caps to melt. And in a matter of 20 to 30 years the melting of the polar ice caps could cause flooding inland of major parts all over the world for as far as 200 to 300 miles. To further aggravate the problem, when the polar ice caps melt and the water level of the oceans is raised the balance of the earth will be upset, the axis will be shifted and there will be some cataclysms such as earthquakes.

Meanwhile we search for more fuel, we have more consumption of fuel, we have more pollution knowing full well that there is a limited supply. Scientists the world over agree that there is no hope if something is not done immediately. Some scientists say we have ten years, some scientists say we have 40 years, but the argument is purely academic. I cite this problem to demonstrate the gravity of the pollution problem.

Now what can Saskatchewan do? You might say that it is too small to act on such an immense problem but I have chosen an immense problem to show what Saskatchewan can do and how the solution to the problem might be related to unemployment and help the world as well. This solution is somewhat facetious and it does require more imagination than Lorne Harasen has. First, let us recognize the problem. We have a shortage of oxygen, it is complicated by fuel consumption reaching a perditious level and it is aggravated by short-sighted financial interests which search only for more fuel to consume. Second we require that we need more oxygen in the atmosphere and we need less fuel consumption or we need a combination of the two. Thirdly, what can Saskatchewan do about such a perditious problem. We have two assets here right now. Saskatchewan has natural resource of which it has plenty, and that is water. Saskatchewan also has a tremendous potential for power generation. If 20 kilowatt hours of electricity are passed through a gallon of water it decomposes a gallon of water into its natural elements, hydrogen and oxygen. If hydrogen, on the other hand, is placed in an electrolyted fuel cell at room temperature it will generate electricity and the by-product of the generation is water vapor, totally harmless and non-polluting. The energy that is generated from this fuel cell from the input of hydrogen can be used to drive every vehicle that is known to man. And pound for pound hydrogen has far, far more kilocalories, far more energy than gasoline. So hydrogen will provide as much as five times more power than gasoline. It will operate at room temperature and it will not pollute the atmosphere. Furthermore, out of a gallon of water we get 8.8 pounds of oxygen.

Oxygen is going to be a saleable commodity in the next 20 years. As a matter of fact presently, Japan is selling oxygen particularly in downtown Tokyo to people who cannot breathe because of pollution. Saskatchewan, by electrolysing water through its own generation of power can solve a major world problem. It is a natural resource based industry which doesn't deplete in supply. At least it won't deplete for the next fifteen to twenty million years. There are subsidiary industries which could be related to electrolysis of water not the least of which might be the manufacture of electrolytic fuel cells plus the promotion of the enterprise.

Now the question you might ask is what will Saskatchewan do with the oil industry? Well, we're not getting anything out of the oil industry in the first place and Imperial Oil is pulling out. And so what I would suggest we do with the oil industry is set up a petrochemical plant. Petrochemical plants are not uncommon in the world. They are not expensive to build, relatively inexpensive, that is. And they produce, above all else, plastics. Out of a ton of crude oil, 50,000 different plastic items can be made as opposed to burning it and polluting the atmosphere. Out of the plastic that is made from crude oil from the petrochemical plant we can make houses, we can make geodesic domes, we can make cars, we can make monorails, we can make virtually everything we now produce out of wood, steel or glass. The fact that we need houses the world over is obvious. What would we do with plastic geodesic homes? We would put them into the North in cold Arctic areas, we would put them over the tops of cities beyond the stage of curing pollution problems, we would use them in the future for space travel. When this business gets so large that Saskatchewan no longer has enough water to electrolyse we could then pipe water from the oceans and out of the electrolysis of ocean water we not only get hydrogen and oxygen but we get beryllium, nickel, chromium, iron manganese, magnesium, fluorine, chlorine, and iodine, just to mention some of the major by-products.

Since we will now be building houses from plastics we will no longer need the lumbering industry, and if we no longer need the lumbering industry it means we no longer have to cut down trees. Therefore, we plant more trees, trees will provide more oxygen to the atmosphere which, of course, was the original problem, and since trees are beautiful, the trees in Saskatchewan will also attract American tourists. And from the American tourists we will get American money. Then we turn around and lend the American money back to the Americans so that they can buy geodesic domes and oxygen from us.

Now, of course, there are a few minor things to straighten out in this somewhat facetious problem to establish the power plants, the electrolysis, the petrochemical plants, the plastics plants all together to initiate an enterprise such as this. It would not cost even three billion dollars. For Lorne Harasen's information, this project would only cost one billion dollars.

The solution to a world problem like this does not inhibit technical progress. Hydrogen fuel cells would provide for more technical progress. It doesn't pollute the atmosphere since water vapor is the only by-product. Furthermore, it solves the unemployment and regional disparity problem Saskatchewan faces and it is an example to the world of what can be done in an ecological cycle which is non-polluting. It is not just a figment of the imagination and it is not an idealistic concept. It is very feasible and it is scientifically possible.

I don't expect the Government to act on a program such as this. I merely use the example to illustrate what government can do with a little bit of imagination. And I use it to illustrate that Saskatchewan is not disparaged and that it is not depressed. After all, we must remember, that Switzerland didn't have a propensity to build clocks, it simply had a lot of time on their hands.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

April 6, 1973

Mr. Lange: — And Switzerland is far, far more depressed than Saskatchewan is. Saskatchewan has natural resources which are almost unlimited. The problem is not one of unemployment. The problem is one of governments using imagination integrated with planning and organization.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the Motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H.H. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a few words to those of my colleagues on the problem of unemployment.

I must admit that I didn't quite follow all the arguments offered by the previous speaker, but certainly I want to get a hold of his speech and digest it a little more. It might have some possibilities for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I enter this debate because unemployment is a very serious problem. I think it's recognized by Members on both sides of the House and by Members in Ottawa. The problem, I think is, what can be done to lessen the degree of unemployment?

One of the things we could possibly do is have more programs like investing in Intercon; making absolutely certain that the industries stay in Saskatchewan. We certainly wouldn't sit on our fannies like the Members did opposite when they were told that Quaker Oats was going to move out (they were still in power) and they did absolutely nothing and let the industry move from Saskatchewan and throw 123 families out of their jobs in Saskatoon.

An Hon. Member: — . . . Intercon . . .

Mr. Rolfes: — Quaker Oats, I am talking about. You're a little slow in your thinking; I've moved on to Quaker Oats.

The Members opposite did absolutely nothing when Husky moved out of Moose Jaw. The Members did absolutely nothing when Gulf moved out of Saskatoon. And I suppose that our Government is doing very little to stop Esso from moving out of Saskatchewan, and that, Mr. Speaker, is sad. It's sad, Mr. Speaker, because I believe the provincial government can't do anything about it. It has to be a national policy and I am rather pleased to hear people of the stature of Eric Kierans, and I heard last night that — and I don't know what portfolio he has — the Hon. Mr. Goyette also coming out and saying that this problem is very serious and that the Federal Government had better come up with a policy very soon, otherwise high unemployment would remain in this country for the foreseeable future.

I think there are Members at Ottawa who understand that it is a national problem. It is not a provincial problem that can be solved by provincial governments only. But, Mr. Speaker, I will . . .

Mr. Lane: — Pass the buck.

Mr. Rolfes: — I will not pass the buck. There are things that a provincial government can do and this Government has taken some steps to alleviate the problem of unemployment. This Government has said that we are concerned about national corporations or multi-national corporations moving out when they find that it is not as economical to stay in Saskatchewan as it is to move to bigger plants in Alberta or some other part of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I enter this debate with some note of pessimism. The reason I do so is because I believe the politicians in Ottawa will do absolutely nothing to alleviate the problem of unemployment, Mr. Speaker, I say this because of the close alliance and the dependence that the Federal Government has on multi-national corporations. It will not make those fiscal monetary changes that our colleague from Nutana Centre talked about when he entered this debate. They will not make these changes, Mr. Speaker, because they know that their life's blood is dependant upon multi-national corporations. The Federal Government is unwilling, but not unable, to implement policies that could increase employment because to a very large degree, Mr. Speaker, it has the power to do so, but it will not make these changes because of its dependence on multi-national corporations. To a very large extent fiscal monetary policies, Mr. Speaker, are decided in the board rooms of big conglomerates like IT&T. Their wheelings and dealings in the international money markets, in buying and selling of currencies, often affect the currency value of a country and thus have a significant influence on the economy of that country and on the unemployment levels of those countries.

I will verify this, Mr. Speaker, with some clippings from the newspapers a little later. In some instances, the gross budget of these conglomerates are many times larger than some countries and any decisions they make can have significant repercussions in the economic activity and employment levels of many countries. I want to refer to an article that appeared in the Star-Phoenix of March 17, 1973 and the caption says: "Effects of Global Companies on Money Markets Studied."

The United States Senate right now, is undertaking hearings to see the effects of multi-national corporations on the currency of the world. I just want to quote from that article. It says:

A background to these hearings lies in the fact that billions of dollars deployed across the world's market by these corporations, or the international companies as they are sometimes known, critically weakened the dollar in the recent devaluation crisis.

And this article goes on to speak about the magnitude of the multi-national corporations. It says:

Some idea of the magnitude of these corporations was given in the recent report by the United States Government Finance Committee, which noted that private business on the international money market controlled more than \$250 billion in short-term liquid assets in 1972. This sum is more than double the total holdings of national central banks and such global institutions as the International Monetary Fund.

And all these multi-national corporations have to do is move

April 6, 1973

\$40, \$50 or \$60 billion around and they can influence the economy of any country they wish, or the economy of the world as such. No doubt they do. The article continues:

Volkswagen just recently saved themselves \$60 million by moving around their dollar portfolio prior to the US devaluation on December, 1971.

Sixty million dollars by simply moving the money from one place to another. Mr. Speaker, it says further about moving of money and the effect that it will have on the other countries and how it will affect multi-national corporations. It says:

Large movements of money on the exchanges are thus very common.

This brings us to our final question about who moves this sort of money around.

In effect, a large part of dollar movements on world markets originated, not with speculators, but with the ultra-respectable managers of multi-national corporations.

Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that the Federal Government, because of its close allegiance with multi-national corporations, will not make those monetary and fiscal changes that are necessary to create full employment. Mr. Speaker, this is not the saddest thing about it. What is really bad is when international corporations purposely go into a country and try to ruin the economy, because they don't happen to agree with the philosophy of a particular government. I want to give you an example of IT&T's involvement in Chile.

If you examine IT&T's desperate attempt to topple the Allende Government for the past few years and how IT&T used its influence over American politicians for intervention into the affairs of Chile, then one can realize how vulnerable the Canadian Government is because of its dependence on large corporations. I have some headlines from which I will read: "Chilean Chaos: IT&T Goal Says Senator".

Senator Frank Church says it is clear, International Telephones and Telegraph Corporation tried in 1971 to promote economic chaos in Chile.

To promote economic chaos. In another article it says:

Latin American specialists for International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation have acknowledged offering assistance to political foes of President Salvador Allende of Chile.

Mr. Speaker, the article goes on in stating how IT&T officials tried to get American politicians to help them in upsetting the economy of Chile, not having any regard what this would do to the unemployment in Chile and to the people of that country. It is my contention, Mr. Speaker, if they can do it in Chile, they can do it in United States and they can do it in Canada. And it is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that they do and because of the alliance that the Federal Government has with multi-corporations, they will not make those fiscal monetary changes that are necessary.

Mr. Speaker, many corporations have recently been given tax concessions by the Federal Government. These tax concessions it was contended would increase employment. However, Mr. Speaker, we know, it is a fact, that many of these corporations simply replaced old machinery with new machinery, machinery that would employ fewer men and there was no guarantee that these companies would have to hire more people. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the policies of the Federal Government in giving these tax concessions and these big write-offs did not increase employment rather they decreased the employment situation. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that as long as the Federal Government places more emphasis on capital intensive projects and less emphasis on labor intensive projects, and as long as corporations are not required to create new jobs for tax concessions received, there is absolutely no hope in solving the unemployment problem. What we need to do, Mr. Speaker, and I agree with my colleague from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards), what we need to do is to replace a capitalist free-enterprise government with a people's oriented socialist government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — We've got to have a government, Mr. Speaker, that is concerned with people and is concerned with the welfare of people, and is not absolutely and primarily concerned with making profits.

Mr. Speaker, there must be more government participation with private enterprise, or if that will not work, there must be more public ownership and development of our primary resources. These resources, Mr. Speaker, must be processed at their source, so that we can have more secondary industry and thus create more employment.

Mr. Speaker, although I believe the Federal Government will do very little for the long-range program in making these fiscal and monetary changes so that we can have full employment, there are certain things that the Federal Government can do and I will just list a few.

1. Mr. Speaker, we know that the low income group spends most of the dollars that they earn. Therefore — and we passed this motion this morning — I would ask the Federal Government to increase the basic old age pensions to \$150 a month and also reduce the age eligibility to 60. This, Mr. Speaker, would permit many people to retire earlier and will make more room available for younger people.

Mr. Boldt: — Make them unemployed.

Mr. Rolfes: — No, it will not make them unemployed. Voluntary retirement. There are many people, Hon. Member for Rosthern, who wish to retire early, but cannot do so because their low pensions prevent them from retiring, it penalizes them from retiring earlier. That does not mean that they cannot do voluntary work in society. There are a lot of people who are quite willing when retired to work without receiving a salary, on community projects. Quite willing to do so.

2. The Federal Government could increase basic tax exemptions to \$4,000 for a couple and \$500 for each child.

April 6, 1973

I say that, Mr. Speaker, because my basic assumption is that people in the lower income brackets spend most of their income and if we raise the basic exemption then these people will have more money that they can spend and, therefore, they will increase the economic activity in the country and produce more jobs.

3. The Federal Government right across this country should increase the minimum wage to \$2.50 per hour.

4. The Federal Government should try to implement a 32 hour work week. This again, will put more people to work.

5. The Federal Government should enact legislation which would require all employers, and employees to participate in a locked-in vested pension plan.

I know that this is a long-range program, a long-range objective, but we've got to look ahead to the future. There are many people who today are working at 65, 66, 69 years of age, who wish to retire but cannot do so because their pension is not satisfactory.

6. The Federal Government should enact legislation which would enable people to qualify for full pension with 30 years employment.

7. The Federal Government should relax its policy concerning senior citizens' homes.

I have already spoken on this during this Session and I would hope that by relaxing its policy senior citizens would be able to repair their homes and thus create more employment. I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that during this Session we have passed a Bill which will give senior citizens additional funds for repairing of their homes in this province.

8. The Federal Government should give more assistance in the construction and repair of houses.

Again I want to commend the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) for establishing a housing corporation. This Government, Mr. Speaker, is doing something for our senior citizens. This Government is doing something to alleviate the problems of unemployment.

9. This is a very minor thing that the Federal Government can do, but it's an important one concerning the Winter Works Program. What they have to do is announce their Winter Works Programs at least two months in advance to what they have done in the past, so that we in Saskatchewan can take full advantage of the Winter Works Program.

10. The Federal Government must correct the unfair transportation and freight rates for the Prairies. We cannot possibly have secondary industries and industrialize this province with the present unfair freight rates that exist.

Mr. Speaker, many of the suggestions that I have made are only stop-gap measures and are not long-term solutions to creating full employment. However, both the Federal and Provincial Governments should take full advantage of the stop-gap measures to at least alleviate some of the difficulties caused by the present high level of unemployment in Canada.

If this is not done, Mr. Speaker, then the words of Eric Kierans and the words of some of the other Federal Ministers who seem to have very little influence in Ottawa will certainly come true. That unemployment in Canada will remain at a very high level for the foreseeable future.

Some of the suggestions if acted upon will not have any immediate effect on the present unemployment situation but could well have favorable results in the future.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to urge the Federal Government to make the fundamental changes necessary in their economic policy which will have the desired effect of creating employment. We ask them to be bold in their decision making. And place more emphasis on the welfare of Canadians rather than the effects their policies may have on the profit levels of huge conglomerates.

Mr. Speaker, from what I have said, you will note that I will support the main motion and not the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, the Member who has just taken his seat has pointed out a number of actions which could be taken by the Federal Government in dealing with the problem of unemployment. I am happy to say that our Government has made representations regarding some of these items. For example, the lowering of retirement age, which we do believe would provide some assistance to young people who are looking for work.

When I see a motion changed through an amendment such as this, to suggest that it is a provincial responsibility, I wonder how serious Members are.

It was not our Government, or our Premier, who said rather bluntly that he was quite willing to face 6 per cent unemployment in order to beat inflation.

Mr. Lane: — You said 4 per cent.

Mr. Taylor: — It was a government in Ottawa led by the present Prime Minister who made that statement. And I want to suggest it's the only successful policy they have ever posed. They have now got that.

We said we were not willing to accept 6 per cent or 7, our government has never said we were willing to accept 4 or 3 or 2. Our Government is not willing to accept unemployment at all, for we see no reason for it.

Let me give you an example, Mr. Speaker. Our Government was concerned with unemployment and has been taking some action this past winter in a number of ways. About the beginning of December the Federal Minister responsible made a grand announcement that he was placing more money into the LIP projects, in order to provide more jobs for Canadians. Now this I remind you, Mr. Speaker, was around the 1st of December that he made this announcement.

April 6, 1973

The unfortunate thing was that the 31st of December was the deadline for applications. And suddenly he tells us money will be available but you have got about three weeks in which to organize your group and get applications in. Remember at that time, in the month of December, civil servants in Ottawa and here were on holidays for a number of days — Christmas and New Year's.

As soon as I read that announcement in the newspaper, I contacted the Federal Minister by telegram, by letter and by telephone. I asked him if he would set aside some of the great new funds that were being established or put up. Incidentally, I congratulated him for the move. I asked him if he would set aside some of these funds for the use of welfare clients. The Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) makes a great deal about welfare people not working. We wanted to provide jobs for just that segment of the population. And we asked that these funds be set aside for this purpose.

Secondly, we asked that the deadline for applications be extended to January 31st, because we felt that three weeks just wasn't enough time. At the same time we appointed new staff members on a temporary basis whose only job would be to help client groups to organize to take advantage of these funds. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it didn't quite work out that way. First of all, there was a refusal to extend the program to January 31st. And secondly, in spite of all the new funds that suddenly were announced to be available, we found that no new projects would be authorized. There seemed to be some sort of break down somewhere along the line. We wonder if the announcement was anything more than a political ploy.

In spite of that we did go ahead with hiring temporary staff in order to assist us in placing clients. And during the Winter Works Program we have placed over 200 of our clients from the assistance roll, into employment opportunity positions.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I resent on behalf of the poor of Saskatchewan, any suggestion from any Member that they are too lazy to work. The clients on the rolls of the assistance plan by far in the majority want a job, if one is going to be provided.

Because of that conviction, Mr. Speaker, because of our experience this past winter, we have now established a plan for the summer. It is an experiment, and we admit that. There is always the possibility that it will fail. We don't think so. We are going to establish three different projects which will hire clients now on the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. One will be called the Summer Employment Support Program. We have already sent notification to the clients of the Department of Social Services regarding this. This program is available to people who are currently receiving financial assistance through our Department. It will provide grants for projects that are designed and operated by client groups. They might be new groups specifically gathered together for the purpose of applying for such projects, or they might be existing organizations. Projects must offer new services to the community, or new approaches to existing programs of the Government or of the municipalities.

We are establishing a work activity program which will involve park construction and beautification. These will be administered by the Department of Natural Resources. Clients will

be referred by my Department. These projects are training programs and will be in addition to any other projects planned for this summer by the Department of Natural Resources. It will not in any way interfere with any of the present programs carried on by that Department or any of the present employees hired.

We are hiring a number of clients to conduct a housing survey this summer. Another project which will involve our clients.

We expect in this way to hire approximately 450 clients from the rolls of the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan for summer work.

Mr. Speaker, it might also be noted, rather interestingly in this regard, that the Government of Canada cost-shares our welfare program. And we are thankful for this. We appreciate it. They pay 50 cents, approximately of every dollar that we spend on welfare, sometimes a little less. But approximately 50 cents. But that same Government will not cost-share any job creation that we try to conduct. In other words, when our Government, through any program, creates jobs in the service industry we pay the whole shot and we lose half the cost-sharing that we had been getting from Ottawa. There is no encouragement from the Federal Government for us to help our clients go to work. Because as soon as we do, it costs us 50 cents on the dollar. I think the Members opposite are probably aware of this. Certainly those who sat on the Treasury Benches before or those who had anything to do with my Department before.

This is one of the things that we should like to have changed. And we will be discussing this with our Federal counterparts in the upcoming conference.

Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to encourage work and to encourage people to participate in the labor force, I might mention that we are today subsidizing the incomes of some 1,300 families in this province. People who are working but whose wages are below what they need to live on. And I think, for one, that is a step that we have to take further. We have to ensure that people who are working are getting enough to eat, to clothe their families, and to provide some of the things that society seems to accept as normal requirements of family life. So we are subsidizing some incomes and this provides at least a partial work incentive. We believe that we are going to have to expand this kind of program in the future. We are looking at it very carefully. We are looking at the questions of incentives within the welfare plan. We are looking at ways of creating jobs, ways of encouraging people to work.

But, Mr. Speaker, when people say they are too lazy to work, let me tell this House that just a week ago I took an issue of the Leader-Post. I read through the want ads, and that is what everyone refers us to, to look at all the jobs that were listed. Why can't they find some work? And in all the want ads I read, I found two jobs that didn't require first of all some sort of basic educational requirements, or secondly, previous experience. And most of the people on our rolls don't have that combination.

Approximately 4 per cent of the people on the rolls of the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan are under 45 years of age with not

April 6, 1973

over grade seven education. And in our society, like it or not, that is a severe stumbling block in finding a job placement.

So, Mr. Speaker, I shall be very happy to support the motion. As I look at our attempts in the past, our negotiations with our Federal counterparts and our hopes for the future, I believe that this Government is seriously undertaking a program to assist people in finding jobs. And I think that this House ought now to ask the Federal authorities to accept their responsibility in the same regard.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to take part in this debate. But after listening to some of the speakers this morning, I don't think we can leave some of the things unanswered.

First of all the Member for Bengough (Mr. Lange) showed exactly what the socialist attitude is to the people who are unemployed. I am not suggesting that the comments that he made may not have some relevance 50 or 100 years from now. But I think the people who are walking down the streets of Saskatoon and Regina today want to know what the Government opposite is going to do to provide a job now. Not 100 years from now.

But it is the same old socialist tactics of using theories that may or may never be practical to try and solve the problems of today.

And then the Member for Saskatoon Nutana (Mr. Rolfes) got up. I don't know whether he was speaking on behalf of the Government or not. But I should like to know whether this is the Government program, \$2.50 per hour minimum wage. And a 32-hour week. Because I will tell Members opposite that if they bring in that legislation you will put every small business in town in the Province of Saskatchewan out of business in less than a month. You saw what happened when the minimum wage was raised a year ago. There were less people employed than there were before. The managers and the owners of these small businesses had to put in 24 hours a day themselves because they couldn't afford to hire the extra staff or to pay the staff those new wages under the minimum hours. And now you talk about a 32-hour week.

The first thing you want — you don't want anybody to work. They will all be on welfare and I think that is the real socialist plan of the Government. Then we had him saying you know what we need in Ottawa is a socialist government because they would be concerned with people. We see every day in Ottawa what the NDP is concerned with. They are not concerned with people. They have been voting with the Liberal Government down there from the day of the election last fall, not because of their concern for people, but for the concern for their own political safety. That is why they are voting for the Liberal Government. Then the Member for Saskatoon says, "What we need is Government ownership to provide jobs." So what have we seen in the last couple of months? We saw 45 per cent Government ownership in Intercon. How many new jobs did you provide for \$10.2 million, which was also \$6 million more than you should have spent.

Let's look at the money that you spent to increase your holdings in Interprovincial Steel and Pipe. How many new jobs did that provide? It didn't provide one job. And then you turn around and in the last two years, counting this year, you are going to spend \$30 million buying up the farmers' land. Taking the land from the farmer — \$30 million! How many new jobs has that provided? Not one new job.

Then you had a chance to develop our natural resources. The Member for Saskatoon said, "Oh, we have got to get some of our primary resources developed." What did they do? They took \$6 million of the taxpayers' dollars and handed it to Parsons and Whittemore. How many new jobs did you create with that \$6 million? Not one.

I have a Return here on my desk where last summer they went out prospecting in northern Saskatchewan. They spent \$104,000. I think they had 23 men in the field. And how many claims were staked as a result at the end of the summer? Nineteen! Pretty expensive development of our primary resources for the number of new jobs provided with that \$104,000.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Saskatoon doesn't know what he is talking about, when he says that Government ownership as shown by his Government provides new jobs. You spent more than \$50 million of the taxpayers' money and you haven't provided one new job.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — And you are going to put some more money into Sask. Oil Corporation. I suggest that in the year coming up that you won't provide one new job there except civil servants who have had the NDP blood test. There have been only 1,200 new jobs provided since they took office. And you know where they all are? They are in the offices of the Ministers and deputies and the executive assistants. That is where the new jobs are. And it is not open to everybody. It is not open to the man who is going down the street today who is unemployed unless he can go and have a political blood test taken. They are the only jobs that you fellows have been able to create. So don't stand up and say that you have the answer. You haven't had an answer for 19 months. You have had the highest unemployment this province has ever seen. And you sit there and the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor) said, "Well we were waiting in December." What were they waiting for? They were waiting for Ottawa to do something. That has always been your problem. You are always waiting for somebody else to do your job for you.

Now I suggest that you take the money that you have spent, the \$50 million and if you have extra money, such as the money from Ottawa, get off your backsides, go out and bring in programs yourself and create jobs in Saskatchewan.

That is what you were elected for so get on with it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I didn't want to enter the debate until the Minister of Social Services — and you will recall it — he mentioned my name that I was referring to the unemployed, or

those on welfare, as lazy and resent work.

Well, you know there is a good percentage of those on welfare that just refuse to work and you know it and your Members know it. The public is getting absolutely fed up with the way in which you are administering welfare.

One year ago your Department expenditures were \$66 million, this year they are \$88 million. Sure there are a few transfers made from Health, but the Health Department is up about \$11 million or \$12 million as well. In 1964, when we took over from your Government, inside of two years the Liberal Government took 25 per cent of the people off welfare and there wasn't anybody that was suffering. But your philosophy is just to catch votes and put people on welfare one after the other. You don't care a hoot whether they work or not as long as you give them more, more social aid so that when election time comes around you will have these people who will follow you.

Surely to goodness what the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) said is so true when you increased the minimum wage from \$1.50 to \$1.75, you created more unemployment by that measure than any other measure that I can think of. If you raise the minimum wage to \$2.50 an hour, you will close every small businessman, or at least keep him from hiring students that would work for a couple of hours a day or on the weekend, they just can't afford to hire them.

Mr. Comer: — How much would you pay, Dave?

Mr. Boldt: — Well, the Member for Saskatoon said that we should have a retirement age at 60. Put another thousand or thousands of people unemployed. Well these 60 year old people today live up to 100 years and they don't want to be unemployed for 40 years of their life. They want to work. But you encourage these people to go on the welfare rolls, you are going to give them more welfare and retire them at 60. And if they retire at 60, the next motion you will put on the Order Paper is retire at 50.

Your philosophy is entirely wrong! The Member for Saskatoon says, oh, we should reduce the income tax and raise the exemption up to \$4,000 and yet this Government has the gall to raise the income tax. They are the ones that raised it. In Manitoba they have reduced it but these brothers here of the Manitoba NDP have raised the income tax.

I want to tell you another thing. I agree with the Welfare Minister that the Federal Government should not cut the contributions when there are jobs created which do not bring enough income for a welfare recipient. This is what I hold against the Federal Government, that they are so closely identified with the socialists here in Saskatchewan, that you can hardly see the difference. And one of the reasons is that they have to cater to Mr. Lewis and this is what is wrong.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — This is what is wrong with the people in Ottawa. I agree that if a man is on welfare and if he wants a job and he gets \$200 per month, and would qualify for \$400 welfare, the

welfare of \$200 should continue. This is the only way that you are going to get these people to work. We have spoiled our people. And as long as there is farmer after farmer looking for help — the Minister of Welfare doesn't have to look in the Leader-Post to see how many jobs there are. You know you don't get jobs by advertising. The only way that you are going to get a job if you are unemployed and you haven't got a grade 10 education, is to walk the streets and look for work. And when somebody is looking for work, he is going to be hired.

Today, all you have to do is put in an ad or put an ad in the paper and you go to the unemployment insurance office and register if you haven't got work, and if you haven't got work within 10 days or whatever the regulations are, you qualify for unemployment insurance or welfare.

Well what did the people do during the '30s? They walked miles on dusty roads and they were picked up and they got work. They didn't want welfare. But today the welfare people are better off than those people off welfare. I sometimes wonder why we people are so foolish to work.

We work our heads off to stay above board and those people on welfare, they are happier than the Attorney General is. Absolutely! You give them medicare, hospitalization free and they have their bread and butter, and they get their beer and they get their tobacco. And you know the Attorney General has to work at least 16 hours a day. But they don't. I can't fathom what kind of a government we have.

You know the Good Book tells us that by the sweat of the brow you are supposed to eat your daily bread and that still holds true today. Your Government doesn't believe in that kind of philosophy.

Well, maybe the Member for Notukeu-Willow Bunch (Mr. Engel) does believe, but stand up and be counted. Put your vote where your mouth is.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — When I talk to the Members outside the House they agree with me 100 per cent, but for political purposes in the House, you want to cater to the young people and I would agree with you that it will be a tough time to defeat the NDP. It will be very tough, but it won't be tough with the farmers, it won't be tough for the people who want to work. But you are getting more and more people into your fold that you control with the pocketbook.

Those are the ones that are going to support you. I don't want to prolong the debate any longer, Mr. Speaker. I will support the amendment if the NDP Government want to do something for the poor people — and they can do it. They have millions and millions of dollars to pay people to get out of the province; they have millions and millions of dollars to buy up land; they have millions of dollars to put into some industry that doesn't create any jobs. Why don't you put some billions of dollars into some projects that will create jobs?

I will support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

April 6, 1973

Mr. D.G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Cody: — Stand up, Dave!

Mr. Steuart: — I stood up last night before 310 angry farmers. I stood up and I talked to them and I wish I had known what was going on in the House when our arrogant Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) blurted out the truth that cattlemen are next. So I am standing up and people are listening to me, so don't worry about it. You don't have to worry about whether they can hear me or see me, just worry about what they are hearing and seeing over there.

This debate is typical. This Resolution is typical, crying to Ottawa. When you were the Opposition you had all the answers. When I sat on that side of the House we heard the criticisms about the unemployed, we heard about all the wonderful things that the NDP would do in their New Deal for People. And you got elected and the unemployment figures started to grow.

Mr. Messer: — We will get re-elected.

Mr. Steuart: — We will see if you get re-elected, Mr. Messer. You may find that that swelled head of yours may be back making an honest living for a change, growing rapeseed or whatever you do.

This Government received a warning back in November. It received it from Jim Chase, General Manager of the Saskatchewan Construction Association, that this industry was facing a job crisis, that there would be serious unemployment in the winter. They received it from Al Newman, Business Manager of the construction in general workers Local 890. He said, a 50 per cent unemployment rate is expected in his union's membership in the coming winter.

Snyder didn't know anything about it. Snyder doesn't know anything that is going on. We should call him the Minister of the Unemployed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — What did the Premier say? What was his answer to the people in the construction trade, not just the management of the construction trade, but the union workers? His answer was almost, let them eat cake. 'Job forecast said inaccurate'.

Comments from the construction trade that Saskatchewan is heading into a winter of low construction activity are inaccurate, said Premier Blakeney.

Then he went on to say that "we are launching, what we consider a massive Winter Works Program."

Some massive Winter Works Program! Look at their record. December 1971 the unemployment was 5.4; 1972 it got up to 5.5 and there were 19,000 people looking for work in this province. Then in 1973, January, it had risen to 24,000 people, 7 per cent. One of the worst records in this province for years. 24,000 people looking for work. On top of that there were fewer

people, there were 10,000 people less living in Saskatchewan and 24,000 people more looking for work.

The House recessed from 12:30 to 2:30 o'clock p.m.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. D.L. Faris (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I should like at this time to introduce to the Assembly, two groups of students in the west gallery. There are the Grade Eight students from Loreburn, accompanied by Mr. Hofmeister, some 29 students. And the Grade Twelve students from Davidson, accompanied by their teacher Mr. Wouters and their driver Mr. Bessey.

I want to welcome these students to the House and hope they will find this afternoon's Session of interest to them and that they will have a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Gross (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, I should like at this time introduce to you and through you to Members of this Assembly, 20 Grade Seven students from Gravelbourg here today in the west gallery under the guidance of Mr. Paul Ares their principal. I hope that their stay here this afternoon will be educational and also very interesting.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. E.L. Mr. Cowley (Biggar): — Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I introduce to you and through you to this House, a group of 75 Grade Seven and Eight students from Martensville, which is just outside of Saskatoon and in my constituency. They are accompanied by their principal, Mr. Buhler, teachers Mr. Redekopp and Mr. Wiebe and their bus driver Mr. Wiebe. I hope this afternoon will prove both informative and enjoyable for them and I am sure the Leader of the Opposition will do his best to give them an example of parliamentary debate at its very best. I hope that they enjoy their stay and have a good trip home. They are seated in the Speaker's Gallery.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, before we begin the afternoon's proceedings it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce 19 Grade Eleven students from Tramping Lake School. They are accompanied here today by their Principal Mr. Wes Dombroski and two other drivers, not bus drivers, but they are in by car, Mr. Ralph Fluney of Tramping Lake and Mr. Lawrence Kraft. They came down to Regina yesterday, Mr. Speaker. They have visited the RCMP Museum and they have been around the building here prior to this afternoon at 2:30. They are going home tomorrow and I am sure all Members will join with me in wishing them well on their trip to Regina and we hope they have an enjoyable time of it and that they have a safe trip back home.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

April 6, 1973

Hon. Mr. Taylor (Kerrobert-Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the Member for Wilkie in welcoming the students from Tramping Lake, since probably about half of the students live in the good constituency of Kerrobert-Kindersley. I, too, am very happy to see them here. I might mention that both the member for Wilkie and myself will be meeting with them afterwards so that they can see that we can talk at least outside of the House.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

**ADJOURNED DEBATES
RESOLUTIONS
(Continued)**

Resolution No. 14

The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate on Resolution No. 14.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out before lunch, the NDP Government of Saskatchewan brought into this House a resolution condemning the Federal Government for their lack of concern and their lack of action in regard to the jobless of this nation.

We brought in an amendment to that resolution placing the responsibility for the jobless and the unemployed in this province squarely where it belongs, on the shoulders of the Members opposite, on the shoulders of the Blakeney NDP Government.

There is a responsibility for a provincial government to use whatever financial tools that are at its command, to use whatever influence it has to develop policies to provide jobs for the people, the young people, the middle aged and the older people of this province. That is their first responsibility. But instead of facing their responsibility the NDP do what they always do, they whine and they cry and they point to Ottawa in an attempt to divert the attention from their sad and sorry record.

I pointed out that they were given ample warning by people in the construction industry, by union representatives, by people in the work force, that there would be serious unemployment in the province in these past winter months.

Premier Blakeney pooh-poohed this and said that the estimates were not accurate. In fact, his Government had a very adequate program to find jobs for our people in December and January, February and March. Yet when the figures came out he found that unemployment was higher in December of 1972 than December of 1971. Found that unemployment had risen in January of this year, to probably a 10 or 15 or 20 year high in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Then we looked forward to the Budget. We find in the Budget Speech delivered by Mr. Elwood Cowley, this statement on page 30:

We, (the NDP Government) allocated \$5 million to this program and anticipate that it will create 4,200 man-months of employment fully taken up by local governments.

Well, I don't know if it was fully taken up by local governments or not. 4,200 man-months, when you boil that down to actually producing a lifetime job for a man, he would be in the work force of 30 or 35 years, you find out that they were actually talking about 10 jobs, 10 full time jobs, for adult men.

Mr. Speaker, it was not only ridiculous but it was an insult to the jobless in this province. And they come into this House, they offer next to nothing but insults to our people looking for work, and then they have the gall to put on the Order Paper in this Assembly, a resolution condemning the Government at Ottawa.

If the Government at Ottawa needs condemning, fine, let's condemn them. If the Government in Ottawa hasn't done an adequate job to find positions and employment for our young men and women looking for work, then by all means regardless of whether they are Liberal or Conservative or what they are let them stand condemned. But let this NDP Government that was elected after so much promise, that was elected after such a full-blown campaign saying "we'll bring about a New Deal for People, to find them jobs, to give them challenges, to allow them to stay home," look at their record. Mr. Speaker, 24,000 people out of work, far more people out of work, I think it is 10,000 more than the year before and in fact 10,000 people less in the province to be concerned about.

Then we look at Ottawa and at least they make some moves, they cut the income tax. One of the proponents of cutting the income tax to put more money into circulation, to create more jobs and more opportunities for our people was Mr. David Lewis, the National Leader of the NDP. He says this is what is needed and whether they did it because he said it or because their own intuition and their own knowledge of the situation told them to do it, the Federal Liberal Government has, in fact, cut the income tax. But what action did we get from the people opposite, from the NDP of Saskatchewan who claim to be the friend of the working people, claim to be so concerned about our unemployed, so concerned that they put an amount in the Budget that provides for 10 full-time jobs, so concerned that they, in fact, raised the income tax so if there was any value, and I think there was, in turning more money loose in the national economy, the people of Saskatchewan were denied that advantage.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's look at their record for unemployment since they were elected. Practically the first thing they did was cancel the Meadow Lake Pulp Mill. It cost them \$6 million and they boast about it. I challenge them to go up into the northwest corner of this province and take a look at those people, the 8,000 people up there that the NDP literally condemned to rotting on social welfare because the Government has failed, they have not produced one job-producing business or industry in that area. They cancelled the Choiceland iron ore deal, another project that would have given jobs to the North of this province, in fact all over this province to 3,000 to 5,000 people, directly and indirectly. Then what did they do — are they short of money, is that the question? Well, they found \$10.2 million to hand to Mr. Fred Mendel to put in his pocket and take it to California where he lives. Did it produce a new job? Not one new job. Did it produce one new cent of revenue? Not one new cent of revenue. Did it bolster the position, improve the position, strengthen the position of Intercontinental Packers? It did nothing for Intercontinental Packers but it did a lot for the Mendel family. It did absolutely nothing for that industry or for the unemployed, the people looking for work. They found another \$4.5 million, I can see by the paper another \$300,000, that's almost \$5 million. What did they do with that? Well, they went down to the Toronto Stock Exchange. They got some of their people, their

April 6, 1973

friends in the investment bond houses and they sent them into the Toronto Stock Exchange, that bastion of capitalism. What did they do? They bought thousands of shares of Interprovincial Steel Company at about \$15 or \$16. Rather interesting, if they had waited a week or two they could have got them for \$13 or \$14, but showing their usual keen sense of business acumen they bought them for \$15 or \$16. Again, they invested about \$5 million of the taxpayers' money, did they strengthen that firm? Not one iota. Did they produce one new job for our unemployed? No jobs at all. Did they add any revenue to this province? Not a bit. What did they do? They allowed some shareholders of IPSCO who might or might not live in Saskatchewan to sell them their shares and put their money in their own pocket.

Mr. Speaker, someone pointed out that this Government, between cancelling the Meadow Lake Pulp Mill, their terrible, stupid and ill-advised investment in Intercontinental, their equally bad investment in IPSCO and their plowing of about \$30 million into the Land Bank, in total spent \$50 million of the taxpayers' money, to produce what? Not one new job, not one new cent of revenue. In fact they have let most of that money out at an average income on interest of around 4 per cent or 5 per cent or less and they paid 7 or 7½ per cent for the money. They will lose just on the interest alone something like \$2 million a year.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I came across a rather interesting little item that indicates that there is some hope of employment in this province for some people. Oh, no, there is no hope for the young people getting out of our high schools and technical schools, not for people just coming out of our universities, in fact, not for Saskatchewan at all. Here is an ad placed in the New Statesman, which is a left wing British newspaper. Wake up the Saskatoon backbenchers, I should like them to hear this. It says:

Socialist physicians are required to participate in a community owned and controlled multi-specialty group practice of 20,000 in a pleasant university city of the Prairies. A partnership between providers and consumers of health care, working under a tax-financed medical insurance plan trying to humanize and unify preventative therapeutic, ambulatory health care.

Oh, here's another one:

Professional chauvinist should not apply.

Just socialist physicians, they don't want any chauvinists, whatever they are. "Wanted immediately", it says. "Specialists in Psychiatry."

Mr. Kramer: — I presume, Mr. Speaker, that he is prepared to table that and indicate who is paying for the ad.

Mr. Steuart: — I'll even get you an autographed copy and I'll get you a meeting with the psychiatrist as soon as he comes over so that you'll understand what they are talking about. I'll go to great lengths. I will make this available, I want to copy it but I will make it available. I'll lay it on the table and you

are welcome to look at it. In fact I think I will have it reproduced in the Saskatoon paper.

Mr. Kramer: — Will you answer a question?

Mr. Steuart: — As soon as I finish speaking.

Mr. Kramer: — Will he indicate whether that is under the Department of Health, or is that a Government advertisement?

Mr. Steuart: — If the Minister will please sit down . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Steuart: — I am talking about the great opportunities in Saskatchewan, not for the young people, not for the old people, not for Saskatchewan residents, but for socialist physicians of Great Britain. Well, I don't know what a socialist physician is. I know this makes the Members over there squirm and uncomfortable and I don't blame them. The Members that are here, there aren't too many of them here this afternoon, but the ones that are here are earning their pay. I know they are getting just a little bit unhappy.

Family physicians with "wholistic" approach, who are sensitive to the social and emotional needs of their patients.

It says this:

Conditions of service are not bad.

That's what it says and they sure aren't. Here is what these poor socialist, non-chauvinistic, British physicians are going to get:

\$19,000 to \$30,000 per annum with some fringe benefits.

Then it goes on like this:

It is bloody cold for four months of the year.

It doesn't tell them to bring their stanfields but they can get those when they arrive here.

But the sun is always shining.

For the socialists I guess.

Apply to Medical Director, Community Clinic, 455 – 2nd Avenue N., Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

Well, anyway it shows there are opportunities.

An Hon. Member: — Who paid for the ad?

Mr. Steuart: — The Community Clinic, the people's clinic, paid for by the Government under the new global budgeting program. I just point this out, Mr. Speaker, to indicate that all is not

April 6, 1973

hopeless in the Province of Saskatchewan. If you are a non-chauvinistic, socialist, British physician you may look forward to great opportunities in this 'bloody' cold weather here at \$19,000 to \$30,000 a year. But there may be more openings. I've got the Leader-Post here. A very fine, reputable newspaper, April 6, 1973. It seems there might even be some more openings for doctors here in Regina. It indicates here that they get along well and they don't want any upset and they are just not worried about medicine but they are worried about total atmosphere. But here we read, "Doctor side wins in Health Clinic Dispute in Regina". So there may be more openings for physicians. Evidently they had a tremendous fight in the 'people's' clinic. Some of the people on the wrong side — they were the left wingers — how you tell a left winger from a right winger in that party, I don't know but I guess you can. But anyway I would recommend this reading for the Members opposite because it would appear that all is not well in the socialist camp even in the community clinics. So when these non-chauvinistic . . .

Mr. Romanow: — How does this affect unemployment?

Mr. Steuart: — Well, it has lots to do with it. I was just pointing out for your information, I'll repeat it if you wish, but I am sure some of your Members — you are from Saskatoon, did you see the ad? "Socialist Physicians Wanted. Chauvinistic professionals should not apply. \$19,000 to \$30,000 a year." It's for the Community Clinic in Saskatoon. It points out, it says:

It's bloody cold but there are fringe benefits and they will be welcome.

So I was just pointing out that while it may be very difficult for Saskatchewan young people to get jobs, it may be difficult for anybody in Saskatchewan to get jobs, but as a result of the action of the Government of the NDP and the socialists, it is possible for some people to get jobs.

Mr. Speaker, when we were the Government we started a program called STEP. That program allowed business people, farmers, government agencies, hospitals, local communities, anyone, to go out and hire our young people coming out of technical schools and universities for the summer and the Government would pay half the wages. All they had to say was, these are extra jobs. We provided jobs for several thousand people. I see the Minister of Unemployment shaking his head up and down, I don't know whether he is relocating his gum or whether he is trying to indicate to me — he is relocating his gum. Thank you very much. I don't want you students to think the wrong thing, when you get to be a Member of Parliament you can chew gum. It may be against the rules in school but it is not against the rules here.

Okay, we put the program under STEP and we got 3,000 or 4,000 jobs for our young people. This Government changed it. As a matter of fact the total for 1971, when we were the Government, we found jobs for 4,646 students, in business and industry 1,800, on the farms 2,000, institution and local government about 750. What did this Government do? Because they are afraid that somebody might have made a little profit, because

they are afraid our farmers might have received a little help, what did they do? They said no farmers, no business places, no student can receive any assistance if they get a job with a local business man or if they get a job with any farmer. In one fell swoop they are saying to almost 3,000 students, that's the number that got employment in those areas in 1971, almost 4,000 students, 3,950, they are saying, we're sorry, we don't trust the businessmen, we don't trust the farmers and we are cutting them off. So, Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that rather than making any resolutions pointing the finger at Ottawa, I suggest that the Government opposite sit down and take a hard look at their own sorry, sorry record, and that is exactly what it is. I suggest for once that those people sitting in the back benches have the fortitude to say to the Members in the front bench, why are you doing this? Why are you failing the people of Saskatchewan? Why are you failing the young people of this province? Why are you failing your own responsibility? I hope that every one of them will vote for our amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Amendment negated on the following Recorded Division:

YEAS — 11

Messieurs

Steuart	Grant	McPherson
Coupland	Boldt	Lane
Loken	MacDonald (Milestone)	Wiebe
Guy	McIsaac	

NAYS — 32

Messieurs

Dyck	Brockelbank	Faris
Meakes	Pepper	Cody
Wood	Whelan	Gross
Romanow	Kwasnica	Feduniak
Messer	Engel	Comer
Snyder	Owens	Rolfes
Bowerman	Robbins	Lange
Kramer	Tchorzewski	Oliver
Thibault	Cowley	Feschuk
Kowalchuk	Taylor	Flasch
Baker	Matsalla	

The debate continues on the Motion.

Mr. E.C. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Bengough can always be counted on to give us thought provoking and articulate ideas. He did not disappoint us in this debate. The Hon. Member for Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) introduced an aspect of corporate control that should not be forgotten or ignored when we consider unemployment.

The Minister of Social Services made a good case from his own intimate knowledge of the situation. These Members are good representatives and have today made a good contribution to this debate. On other occasions the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder), the Hon. Members for Canora (Mr. Matsalla) and Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins) and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood)

April 6, 1973

have ably and clearly made the argument for this Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) that more businesses went broke in one year under the Liberals, when he was talking about small business, in the city of Regina, than in any other period. That was in 1968 — 135 small businesses went broke and they set a record during that one year when they were in office. And he talks about our consideration of small business.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — The only business that boomed while they were in power was the moving business. And that boomed because people left this Province looking for the 80,000 jobs that he and his colleagues offered the working people. They had to go elsewhere to find them. Their record regarding employment was not acceptable to the people. It was on this record that the Members opposite, when the election came around, were cut to a mere handful. Even the Federal Liberals on their record were cut by 50 per cent. Does the Liberal collapse, federally and provincially, suggest an enthusiastic endorsement of their employment record? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it does not.

Hon. Members opposite talk about our position in Ottawa and where the New Democrats stand.

Mr. Lane: — Right behind the Liberals.

Mr. Whelan: — Well, let me say this to the Hon. Members. You know, there is a difference between crying to Ottawa and working with Ottawa. New Democrat Members who witnessed the battles between the Liberals federally and provincially know that it cost the Members opposite the government. One must draw the conclusion that after hearing the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) this morning, in the typical fashion of Opposition Members, that they have learned nothing. They don't understand the wishes of Saskatchewan people and they are not prepared to work with Ottawa.

You know, Members opposite claim that either we are keeping the Liberals in office in Ottawa or else that the Liberals out of the kindness of their hearts are allowing the New Democrats to stay there as their guests.

Let's get it straight. There is only one party in government, only one party that can call an election and that is not the New Democrats and it is not the Tories. It is the Liberals. And at any time, they can go to the people. In answer to the Members opposite, let them ask their friends in Ottawa to go to the people and see who is afraid. Let them go to the people on their record regarding employment. I challenge them to do exactly that.

Hon. Members criticize our purchase of Intercontinental and IPSCO shares. Compare this with their crocodile tears and expression of sympathy, and nothing more, to the displaced workers as a result of refineries and flour mills closing during their term of office.

Yes, as these displaced workers loaded their belongings

they got sympathy, yes, they did, pages and pages of it in the local paper. Sympathy, no security, but just buckets and buckets of sympathy. At least we, as part owners of these industries, will have something to say about when the business opens, when they close and when they expand.

I am positive that the people who sell their produce to these industries and the people who work in them are not critical of this kind of an expenditure, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — In the debate earlier, and I am glad he is in his seat, the Hon. Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) stated referring to what I said and I am quoting him now, that, “I was proud of the unemployment figures.” Mr. Speaker, he used this remark over and over as if it was accurate. I said, in fact, and I quote: “All Members will be pleased at the reduction,” in the number of unemployed. The terminology the Hon. Member used is nowhere to be found. I was pleased at the reduction, frankly. I don’t think he was.

Judging by the Federal figures, Mr. Speaker, I don’t think he cares. The Hon. Member defends the figure of 700,000 unemployed federally. He attempts to criticize provincially in the face of their record when they were in power. As I said earlier in this debate, their performance cost them the Government. It cost Prime Minister Trudeau his majority. The Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) says that I played a cheap political trick when I introduced this Resolution and quoted the Prime Minister. Well, as I said earlier by using unemployment to fight inflation he and his followers pulled an expensive, not a cheap, political trick. It cost billions in production, as I pointed out, and millions in unemployment insurance funds, and hundreds and thousands of jobs, Mr. Speaker.

Frankly, when the Hon. Member said I reworded the motion on the Order Paper because David Lewis asked me to, he was inaccurate, as was most of his inept, rambling, futile effort to explain the failure of his federal colleagues. The truth is that the Resolution was changed on the same advice that the Hon. Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) received when he changed his resolution regarding the Palliser Wheat Growers. Ask him. I think he will tell you why the change came about.

The Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North quotes unemployment figures. If you were to apply his estimate for 1969 by adding those who left, the Members opposite had over 45,000 people seeking work. Frankly, his trip of fancy into figures only proves my suggestion that the Federal Government should do a proper analysis of those out of work, province by province, their age groups, their location and so on. Until then, the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North can tell his fairy tales without being challenged, Liberal style.

The Hon. Member for Albert Park suggested that cancellation of the Choiceland Iron Mine meant the loss of jobs to the people of Saskatchewan. First, he cannot prove that the Choiceland mine was viable and would have gone ahead; second, that it was anything more than a political gimmick set up by the former administration to grab votes.

April 6, 1973

In replying to his claims, those of us who remember the heavy water plant, and the daily announcements that were made in this House, are not going to be influenced by the announcement of the Choiceland mine employment. Nor are we going to be impressed by the employment figures claimed for the Prince Albert Pulp Mill, Mr. Speaker.

The Hon. Member's claims that these might have provided employment are suspect when one considers the facts.

As I pointed out, talk about employment in these terms, under these conditions, after the political spanking and rubbing Members opposite got in the last provincial election, would have to come either from the Member for the postage stamp riding of Albert Park or the patio plot of Moose Jaw North.

As I said in my opening remarks, a program through Crown corporations, to develop manufacturing and secondary industries in the North by use of our timber resources, will provide jobs. The people of the province will have employment as a result.

It is only one of several employment programs, I listed them when I spoke and when I introduced this Resolution. To say that nothing is being done in the face of the organized, carefully planned approach to involve unemployed people in these secondary industries is to ignore the facts. Compare it, if you will, with the headlines for the heavy water plant for a start.

The Hon. Member for the postage stamp riding of Albert Park says that my list of suggestions to be undertaken by the Federal Government in conjunction with the provinces are irrelevancies. The Resolution says and I will quote:

That this Assembly urges the Government of Canada to develop adequate employment schemes to reduce unemployment in Canada.

The programs I have listed will develop adequate employment schemes. I suggest that if the Hon. Member knew about the history of joint programs and their effectiveness regarding employment in community development, he would know why such programs are being suggested. As I pointed out before, they would develop the country and they would provide employment, as any sensible person knows, to quote a former leader of that party, you need the financial backing of the Federal Government to effectively undertake most of these programs.

Let me remind him again and ask him point blank, let me ask him: Will we provide employment by making available money at low interest rates to build homes, by providing sums of money at a low interest rate to provide for housing corporations; to develop housing for senior citizens, students, native people, farmers, co-operative housing? I say, in answer, that this will provide employment. I ask him if he is suggesting that this will not provide employment? Is he suggesting that the Provincial Government has the kind of money needed and can provide it at a low rate of interest? His former Government and his former leader said that this didn't make sense, that you couldn't provide this kind of money; he said it wasn't possible to do it through the Provincial Government.

One of our basic industries is the tourist industry. I

have suggested that the Federal Government provide at a low rate of interest, loans to build proper facilities for the travelling public. This is needed and will provide jobs. Does the Hon. Member suggest that this will not provide employment? Does he suggest that a program, in co-ordination with provincial governments, to build facilities within city limits, along the highways and adjacent to historic sites would not provide employment? It has been tried and it has been successful. It was discontinued. The whole area of developing programs for the tourist industry to provide employment on a joint federal-provincial basis, particularly when you consider what it means to us in terms of income as a country, I suggest, is entirely practical.

Let me look at another suggestion which he criticized, construction of highways, of overpasses and north-south roads, the building of housing facilities and machines to construct these roads. I suggest that this would guarantee employment not only on the roads and on the site but in the shops.

The Canada Pension Plan, too, is under federal jurisdiction. If a citizen has worked for 35 years he should be able to get a full pension under the Canada Pension Plan. This would mean more work available for the young people coming onto the labor market. A shorter work week would provide more work, and the Federal Government is a logical place to begin, particularly the Federal civil service. Again, that Government has the finances; the civil service and their labor code touches every province in Canada. The unemployed are seeking jobs. More people would have to be hired.

The Hon. Member speaks with derision about withdrawal by a contributor of a portion of the Canada Pension Plan to build his own home. This is practised in other countries around the world. It is being recommended by one union after another across this country. Administratively it is no problem. And it would be a small item when one considers the amount of money presently sitting in the Pension Plan. The Hon. Member would rather have people who want to build homes, and who have an investment in the Pension Plan, borrowing money at 8 per cent or 9 per cent or 10 per cent on a 25-year term basis from his friends in the mortgage companies while the contributor's own money, as I said, sits in a fund unused. I suggest it should be put to work. It would provide jobs for those who need jobs.

I repeat, too, a courageous Federal Government would establish the exemptions for those in the lower income bracket to give them more purchasing power, so they could purchase more goods to put more people to work in the factories that produce them.

For the information of the Hon. Member for Albert Park, the waterways of this country cross provincial boundaries. Mercury deposits in the Saskatchewan River end up in the belly of a whale at Fort Churchill. The need for building sewage facilities that will relieve unemployment and will provide environmental control is real but should be a joint federal-provincial undertaking, Mr. Speaker.

As I pointed out in my remarks earlier, exemptions from income tax should be increased for those with large families and small incomes. The benefits for those drawing unemployment insurance should be increased by attaching a cost of living

April 6, 1973

clause. The Hon. Member ridiculed this and I noticed the Minister of Social Services took him up when he spoke today.

The Hon. Member says that the working man will always want to stay on unemployment insurance. Mr. Speaker, this is typical nonsense. Does he think for one moment that these people want to stay on unemployment insurance? Even his former leader knew better than that. He asked, in a written brief, he asked the Federal Government to increase unemployment insurance benefits as I pointed out earlier in this debate. The need for training of staff for senior citizens' homes, recreation and pollution control is necessary and obvious. Only the Hon. Member does not understand the need.

As I pointed out when I opened this debate, we do not know who is unemployed. It is absolutely essential that the Federal Government provide a decent set of statistics. The Hon. Member speaks with derision about withdrawal by a contributor of a portion of the Canada Pension Plan. And I say again, this is not fair, it is unreasonable, it is his own money, he should have access to it.

The Hon. Member for Albert Park criticizes us for not undertaking public works programs. The Motherwell Building in this city, with one-third of the top stories unfinished, is a monument to the attitude and incomplete thinking of the Federal Government. The need for office space, the need for training facilities, the need for housing for RCMP personnel are only a few of the items I would draw to the attention of the Hon. Members opposite. But to suggest that the Provincial Government is lax is ridiculous while all around us in every direction there are federal buildings that are overcrowded, out of date and incomplete. It is preposterous to criticize the Provincial Government. One can see how little his argument is worth when one looks at the record regarding the construction of federal buildings in this province.

Let me repeat the programs I have suggested and let me emphasize that they would be beneficial to us and would provide employment. At present, almost three-quarters of a million men and women are unable to find work and are unable to feel the sense of participation. Those who are not working cost those who are working staggering sums of money.

Mr. Speaker, the programs I have suggested are better and more practical and in total will cost less in terms of money and human resources than the route we are following at the present time. Let me sum up if I may.

First, the province in its limited way can, should and will do the utmost to meet the unemployment problem.

Second, because of its financial resources and the control it has over monetary policies and imports and exports, the Federal Government has the resources and the power and the jurisdiction to solve our problems.

I have suggested a number of programs that might be undertaken and I have listed them for consideration by this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot sit idly by and ignore the plight of the unemployed. We cannot sit idly by and ignore the inactivity of the Federal Government. We cannot sit idly by and

expect unemployment to go away. The program I have suggested could begin now; could begin now to curtail the unemployment figures in this province.

Let me conclude and repeat what I said earlier in the debate.

1. About 700,000 people, or close to it, are out of work in this country.
2. The programs to solve their problems must come from the Federal Government because they control finance, commerce, exports, imports.
3. These programs should be worked out with the provinces.
4. Any delay costs us production and taxes.
5. Most important, these people in this desperate plight are Canadian citizens. Let us mobilize the resources of Canada to help them now.

I urge every Member of this Assembly to support this Resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

FINAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON REVIEW OF LIQUOR REGULATIONS IN SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. D.L. Faris (Arm River) moved, seconded by Mr. D.M. McPherson (Regina Lakeview) that the Final Report of the Special Committee on the Review of Liquor Regulations in Saskatchewan be now received.

Mr. Faris: — Before moving this report, I should like to give thanks to the staff, Mr. Barnhart, Mr. Zakreski, Mrs. Rublee and Mrs. Doan for their work which took place over a period of some eighteen months, and continues to this day. I want also to thank the members of the Committee for putting in many hours and I think giving this matter their serious consideration. As will be found from the report and from the debate which follows, all the members of this Committee do not necessarily agree with one another, but I am pleased to say that the Committee's work was characterized by its non-partisan nature. Perhaps the secret to achieving this is by choosing a subject so controversial as to dim party allegiances. The views expressed in this Committee, in my opinion, reflect the views of individuals. If there had been 12 other individuals on the Committee there may well have been 12 other views expressed. However, I do think that the Committee was highly representative of public opinion; that it did in fact reflect public opinion and just as much in areas of disagreement as of agreement. I am sure that it will be obvious to the Assembly, and I want it to be obvious, that when I present these introductory remarks they are my opinions and I want to be sure that every member of this Committee feels free to enter this debate and speak what his conscience dictates and I have not and will not hesitate to do this.

I think it would be less than honest to pretend that there are not conflicting recommendations in this report. I think it

April 6, 1973

would be equally dishonest to pretend that this conflict does anything but reflect the conflicting views of our society at large, of which this Committee is representative. Compared to any other report that I have seen on liquor regulations in this or any other province in Canada, I think the report's outstanding characteristic will be seen in its discussion of the problems caused by alcohol in our society. By setting this discussion in the context of the social cost of alcohol abuse this report has raised questions that have long been ignored both by legislators and the public. It was the intention of the Committee to arouse public discussion. The Committee has attempted to do this through radio, television and newspaper discussion of the report. The report itself was made available to the public at no cost and the latest report that I have is that nearly 4,000 copies of the report have been requested by the public. Most of this is the public of Saskatchewan, but there have been requests from nearly every other province in Canada. To the best of my knowledge, most MLAs have received some feedback on this report in the form of letters and as chairman of the Committee I have received a considerable quantity of mail.

I want to thank the House leader and the leaders on both sides of the House for giving us plenty of time between the time the report was tabled and this debate, so that we did have this opportunity for public feedback.

I would also encourage the Government not to be anxious in implementing this report, other than perhaps the parts concerning education, rehabilitation, prevention, due to the fact that I think there is going to be, and can be, a very meaningful ongoing debate. I think the report lends itself to this; I think it is a highly educational kind of report and is well worth continued public study.

The Committee played a useful role in stimulating public discussion. It has also played what I think is a rather unusual role in stimulating intergovernmental discussion. In May of 1972, almost a year ago, part of our Committee on one of our tours, met with the Hon. John Munro's executive assistant and several branch heads in Ottawa. The Committee raised the question of national programs in regard to prevention, education, research and rehabilitation pertaining to alcoholism. We were told at that time that we were the first representatives of any provincial government to raise those questions at the policy level. It should be a matter of gratification to the members of the Committee on both sides of the House to have seen in the past year the stated intention of the Federal Government to become involved in these areas and, indeed, the establishment of a Federal Task Force to study and report on precisely these matters.

Chapter I of the report outlines the method of operation of the Committee. Members will observe that the Committee undertook a considerable amount of travel. It is my view that this was warranted and, indeed, was invaluable in enabling the Committee to make comparisons between jurisdictions and to pick up new ideas. On many occasions the Committee (and that includes all members of the Committee) were complimented on their serious and knowledgeable attitude.

Chapter II outlines the alcohol abuse problem in Saskatchewan, some of the characteristics of the alcoholic and a brief outline of the Government's response to the problem.

I think it would be fair to say that the Committee was surprised to find the large extent of alcohol abuse in Saskatchewan. We found that there are over 30,000 people in Saskatchewan who drink amounts of alcohol that are hazardous to their health. Some 20,000 might be clinically defined as alcoholics. That means that well over 100,000 (and it is probably closer to 150,000) Saskatchewan citizens feel the effects of this disease in their lives, in their families and so on.

The Committee attempted to find the direct cost of alcoholism in Saskatchewan in monetary terms. I may say that in terms alone, we were able to estimate that the direct cost of alcohol abuse in 1970 was over \$17.5 million. Adding in indirect costs it would total well over \$20 million. In 1970 the so-called liquor profits (which are really just straight liquor taxation) were some \$26 million — a little less than the likely cost of alcoholism in the province.

What disturbs me is that alcohol abuse in our society is so accepted and it is accepted to a very large extent in our society. The World Health Organization states that alcohol dependence in North America is 100 times that of all other drug dependence. If the problems caused by alcohol abuse were caused by marijuana, I would say there would be public outcries; I would say there would be wild protests. Can you imagine the reaction of the American people if the following newspaper article on marijuana abuse were to appear in the newspapers:

Seventy million people in the United States use marijuana, five million are marijuanics, three out of four marijuanics end up unproductive with broken homes and jobs in jeopardy. More than half of all arrests in California cities are for intoxication with marijuana. According to one study, marijuana was involved in 64 per cent of murders, 70 per cent of physical assault crimes and 50 per cent of shooting and other assaults. Another study found that marijuana was involved in 41 per cent of cases of violent death, 36 per cent of suicides and 50 per cent of auto fatalities.

That's the end of the supposed article.

The truth is, of course, that these statistics refer to alcohol and not marijuana. It was alcohol, not marijuana that was involved in 64 per cent of murders, 70 per cent of physical assaults, 50 per cent of shootings and other assaults, 41 per cent of violent deaths, 36 per cent of suicides and 50 per cent of auto fatalities.

It is no wonder that the Committee says that the personal, social and economic costs of alcoholism are such that it must be considered one of Saskatchewan's major public health issues. Without a doubt, it is our number one drug abuse problem in Saskatchewan and in Canada.

I am opposed to the introduction of the new drugs into our society, such as marijuana, speed and LSD. We know that they are dangerous and we know that they are abused and are going to be abused the more they are accepted. We also know that the one major drug which is legally available in our society is so widely abused that it would be foolish for our society to open itself up to any more. Alcohol is not less dangerous than these drugs in any sense. It is simply that our society over centuries,

April 6, 1973

not just generations, over centuries, has accepted alcohol. The Committee's view is very largely based upon the fact that any realistic policy must aim, not toward prohibition, but rather towards reduction of consumption.

Now there are a variety of personal opinions in regard to the use of alcohol. There is a very valid case to be made for total abstinence. This is a personal decision and I commend this practice to people who choose to follow it. The point I should like to make in regard to this position is that if it is accompanied by a pharisaic self-righteousness, it is not a good position or a valid position, it is a destructive position. There are studies that indicate that not only the homes of alcoholics tend to produce more alcoholics, but also homes where there is a highly emotional negative attitude against alcohol and this kind of unhealthy attitude, with the extremes on either side, I think at this time in history, in our society, are unhealthy.

There are areas in the report that are useful and perhaps some years from now will enable people to look back to this report and say that it has advanced a practical method to reduce alcohol abuse.

The argument in regard to the prevention of alcohol abuse is centered around what we call the social-health approach. This approach entails two views which are not in all ways totally complementary. In some cases they are quite obviously in conflict.

The one view we have called the cultural view. This view argues that we must have healthful social controls on drinking. It admits that there is going to be drinking in society and it says if we are going to have drinking then let's have social pressures that will encourage truly moderate drinking. It would be opposed to the 'forbidden fruit' desirability created about alcohol by prohibition attitudes. It would argue that highly emotional negative feelings towards alcohol have been found to cause alcohol abuse. It would be equally opposed to the elegance, masculinity and sexual myths that commercial advertising, for example, would use to promote alcohol sales. The cultural view would argue strongly that educational programs must be developed to remove the emotional and the mystical aura which surrounds alcohol in our society.

The second view which the report presents is called the Distribution of Consumption View. This view is based on the fact that around the world it is observed that countries which have a low relative price for a unit of alcohol have a high rate of alcoholism, and countries which have a high relative price for a unit of alcohol have a low rate of alcoholism. Both of these are related to the average per capita consumption.

It seems a very obvious statement to say that cheap alcohol leads to large-scale consumption, which leads to large-scale alcohol abuse. It seems obvious, and in fact, it is proven by social science research to be true. If anyone has difficulty understanding this argument, it is generally based on some very basic misunderstandings.

First of all, it must be understood that this argument is based on the relative price of alcohol. The relative price of a unit of alcohol is its price relative to personal disposable

income. The absolute price of alcohol in Saskatchewan and Canada, has gone up since 1933, but the relative price has steadily declined. With very minor exceptions — due to economic fluctuations — the personal disposable incomes of Canadians has risen far faster than the price of alcohol. Therefore, its relative price has steadily decreased.

The second problem of misunderstanding arises from the notion that a pricing policy to reduce consumption is aimed at the present generation of alcoholics. This is not the case. The present generation of alcoholics must be given rehabilitation. Their only hope is total abstinence, total sobriety. The pricing policy will reduce the consumption of those who are not yet alcoholics. It is a preventative measure and in searching through literature and discussing this matter with people across this continent, it is the one truly preventive measure, which along with attitude changing educational programs, I think, could possibly work. There may, in fact, over a period of time, be developed some better methods of prevention and if there are any Members in this House who know of any better methods, then I would be pleased to hear of them. But this is a preventive measure and I think that we must come up with preventive measures. It is no good for us to just go on providing an ambulance service to the thousands of people who are crippled and in fact led to death by the abuse of alcohol.

The arguments in favor of a pricing policy to reduce consumption and thereby reduce the number of alcoholics in future generations is, I think, strong. These arguments are based on the type of evidence which is common in the social sciences as opposed to the exact sciences. That is to say it is circumstantial evidence. It is the same type of evidence as links cigarette smoking to cancer, except that the evidence in relation to the linkage between alcohol consumption and alcohol abuse is stronger.

Surely in a society which is willing to face the fact that there is a dangerous health hazard between heavy cigarette consumption and health we should be willing to face the same relationship between heavy alcohol consumption and alcoholism. It seems to me that a society which is willing to ban cigarette advertising or at least put health warnings about it on packages and to advertise against cigarette abuse should be willing to take the same kind of attitude toward a drug which is far more abused than is tobacco.

Now I will say that these views are strongly opposed by sections of the liquor industry and particularly by those sections of the liquor industry which produce the cheapest sources of alcohol. The profit motive, both in terms of the government and private industry, cannot be ignored in the matter of liquor regulations and as a basis of this kind of opposition.

Mr. Steuart: — The Government's profit!

Mr. Faris: — I mentioned the Government. The Committee has urged a much increased program of education related to alcohol abuse. Much of this must be of a positive nature. That is, people must be shown positive alternatives to the destructive personal habits which lead to alcohol dependence. We feel that such education must not only be of a factual sort, but also oriented

towards changing attitudes. For this reason we have recommended that community-wide educational programs should be experimented with and accelerated. Only a large scale public concern can bring about the kind of change in attitude which will decrease alcohol dependence in our society. The Committee has recommended the use of the mass media to shape and inform public attitudes. Because of the exploitive nature of commercial advertising it is felt that it would be counter-productive to a public education program. The Committee also recommended that a warning label be placed on each bottle or carton of alcohol. It would read, "Warning, Alcohol is a Drug. Its prolonged excessive use may cause impotence, liver damage, brain damage and premature death."

I know that a number of members of the Press Gallery were upset by this label. They wanted to know whether it was true. I assured them that prolonged excessive use would lead to premature death. But that wasn't what they wanted to know. I assured them that prolonged excessive use would lead to brain damage. They agreed that they didn't have much to lose on that one. But that wasn't what they wanted to know. They didn't argue about liver damage, but that wasn't what they wanted to know. Now in regard to their problem, there is some question whether impotence induced by prolonged excessive use of alcohol is a temporary or a permanent condition. Most researchers feel that it is at least a temporary or an acute condition not dissimilar to that suffered by other severely disturbed individuals. However, a recent article in the American Journal of Psychiatry indicates that it may become chronic. The article was co-authored by Dr. James Smith, Medical Director of the Shadel Hospital in Seattle which our Committee incidentally visited. (I don't know what they said about the Members of the Committee) the article is based on the experience of treating over 17,000 patients over a period of 37 years. It quotes Shakespeare saying:

Drink provokes and unprovokes, it provokes the desire but takes away the performance. Therefore much drink may be said to be an equivicator with lechery. Or as one patient said, 'I drank Early times, but the result was Old Grandad.'

The Committee also recommended a vast increase in research. It suggested that the Alcoholism Commission should do before-after research on all major changes in legislation so that the Legislature might know as objectively as possible the result of the changes in the laws which they make. I give the example of the changes in the age of majority law from 21 to 19 then 18. I have heard, and I am sure all Members have heard, a wide variety of opinions on the effect of these changes. I, for one, feel it would be extremely valuable to know what effect they have had on consumption and on drinking patterns. I, for one, would be willing to reassess this or any other law in the light of further information but I think it is extremely unfortunate that we have not, over the years, provided enough research facilities to the Commission in order that they can keep up on this sort of material and feed it steadily and regularly into the Legislature. The fact is that with such information the Legislature can have a great deal of control over alcohol consumption patterns in our society. I believe that with the information given us through the social sciences nowadays much of it which is in this report, information concerning pricing consumption relationships, education, advertising, I feel that

this lays upon this and every other Assembly an increasing moral responsibility to use this information wisely. There is no doubt about it that in the past we very often moved in the dark, not knowing what the result of various changes were going to be. To some extent we have done this up to this point and may continue to do so. But I feel that we have less and less excuse to do this. I think that strong emphasis on research would be extremely valuable for all Members of this Assembly.

The chapter on treatment and rehabilitation is full of valuable ideas concerning improvements in our Commission's programs. The Culliton Committee in 1967, in my opinion, did an excellent job. We felt that it was necessary to give, and is still necessary, to give a large increase in resources to the Commission, both in terms of personnel and in terms of finances, to carry out their job. Basically the directions set in that report were very sound.

I should like to highlight two areas of special emphasis that I feel would be very valuable both in areas of research and planning. The first is in regard to native alcoholism. I believe the problem here is immense. The Native Alcohol Council, the Metis Society, the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians are to be commended for their pioneering efforts in this area. I feel, however, that the Commission itself must be strengthened in this area in order to co-ordinate and up-grade present programs. There is no question at all that native people are very effective in working with native people on this problem. But priorities and an overall strategy must be developed and I think there is some urgency to develop it soon.

The other area I feel will yield very beneficial results is a massive industrial alcoholism program. Through early intervention and constructive coercion pilots of this type of program have shown that they can arrest alcoholism in some 80 per cent of the cases. Most programs arrest only 30 to 40 per cent of cases. If you wait until a man hits skid road then only maybe 5 or 10 per cent of the alcoholics can be helped. This program — the Industrial Alcoholism Program — recognizes alcoholism as a disease and allows the alcoholic employee to take sick leave to receive treatment. The identification of people who require this kind of treatment is simply on the basis of job performance, as alcoholism does very directly influence and deters job performance. After the person has received treatment, once again, he can be judged by job performance.

I believe that if this program were aggressively pursued first of all in the government service, both in the departments and agencies, that it would yield great results. A very high proportion of employees in Saskatchewan are, in fact, employed by the provincial, federal or municipal government. Here is where I think within the government we have the responsibility to set an example in this regard. There are, of course, already some programs going on in some areas within the government, but they are far too confined in my opinion. I know there are also some programs going on in co-operation with industry. Once again these are, insofar as they are being carried out, worthwhile and successful but more could be done. We have an opportunity, I believe, in Saskatchewan both in prevention, education and rehabilitation to set a pattern for all of Canada.

The drinking driver program suggested in Chapter 5

April 6, 1973

recognizes that our present approach to the drinking driver problem is not working. With over 7,000 arrests under the .08 legislation in Saskatchewan last year, we still saw a terrifying increase in death on our highways. It is important to note that over one-third of those who lost their licences were repeaters during the past five-year period. It is simply not good enough to take away a person's licence then put him back on the highway quite possibly in worse shape than ever. We are recommending educational and rehabilitation courses for the convicted drinking driver and in some cases the issuance of hardship licences. The Committee has also recommended the establishment of a Highway Safety Committee and we are pleased to see this proceeded with at this Session.

The recommendation of a .06 blood alcohol level is intended to emphasize the Committee's feeling of the seriousness of the drinking driver problem. This could not, in my opinion, be realistically introduced in a single province but I should like to see it urged upon the Federal Government. A person has a right to drink but he has no right to drink to excess and then attempt to drive.

The last chapter deals with The Liquor Act and The Liquor Licensing Act. I think the recommendations concerning the reorganization of these agencies are most valuable. I like the idea of representation from the Alcoholism Commission on these boards. I like the idea of wider public representation and I feel that if the Board, the Liquor Licensing Commission and the Alcoholism Commission were all responsible to the same Minister there is more hope of an integrated social-health approach to the sale and distribution of beverage alcohol. It is far too easy to fall into a merchandising mentality which looks only at the profits and not the costs.

Obviously up to this point I have been expressing my personal opinion. I want to emphasize that again I will continue to express my personal opinion in discussing some of the recommendations that I disagree with. I basically disagree with recommendations which I feel will increase alcohol consumption without any corresponding beneficial change in drinking habits. I personally do not object, for example, to children drinking with their parents in a restaurant. They have this right to do this in their home and many parents take this opportunity to teach their children that drinking can be moderate and that it can be in a family setting. I hear some mutterings from the Member opposite, but I am sure you will have an opportunity to speak later.

On the beneficial side, I think it does set drinking in a social context with a meal and I think it would, in fact, encourage moderation. It may slightly increase consumption, but even that is not certain. In the mail that I received and the opinions that I received, the feed-back from the report indicates that a very large number of people in this province are opposed to some of the following recommendations. Most of these I oppose because I believe they would increase consumption and not benefit our society in any way.

First of all, this matter of passengers drinking in automobiles. I can in no way support this recommendation. I don't want to see this carried out. I don't want to see a situation where automobiles could be parked on the main street of one of our small towns or villages and people sitting there and drinking. I don't think the people of our communities want to see that either. In regard to drinking in a moving automobile, I think this presents hazards to the driver. I think the social

pressures upon the driver to take a drink are that much greater. There is no way I can support this. I am opposed to the proposal in regard to drinking at sporting events. I believe the reasoning behind this was the idea if you mix drinking with other kinds of activities, then the emphasis won't just be upon drinking and this may lead to some better drinking habits. I know that in Manitoba they experimented with this at their football stadium. First of all they had it so people could drink while they were sitting in the stands and watching the game. They removed it, because of the abuse, the public reaction to this was not good so they took it and put it in a designated area. This is what our Committee suggested, putting it in a designated area. But if you put it in a designated area you have precisely separated drinking from some other activity. Again, you have lost all of the value in this theory that says, relate drinking to some other activity. Therefore, I see no benefit in it.

I am opposed, very strongly, to the identification which the liquor industry have tried to make between sports and alcohol consumption. I think this is not a natural or a healthy kind of relationship; I think it is one that is designed to get to the young people. I am opposed to that. I think that this would be something that would be encouraged by drinking at sporting events.

I am against the idea of allowing drinking in private offices. I know this, along with other matters, are things that go on at present. But I don't see how this law in any way would be beneficial, I see it increasing this kind of practice. In terms of relating this to my desire for an industrial alcoholism program this is just going to make it that much harder to try to help a man who has an alcohol problem to beat it, at work. I don't see the benefit of it. I think that the office party, in fact the cocktail party kind of a situation in our society is a very bad social institution. The idea of people just sitting around and drinking without a meal very often on empty stomachs and so on, is a bad situation. It think this is a bad recommendation.

I am opposed to the recommendation in regard to drinking at campsites in parks and picnic sites.

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — Thanks, Wes. I had considerable comments from parents in regard to this. They feel that this situation already exists, but it is one which is a troublesome one. You have a bunch of people parked very close together in these campsites, with trailers and so on. Somebody is having a party and I have heard from campers, camp officials, that they are having a devil of a time trying to control this right now. I understand from people who have followed the submissions to the hearings from the Meadow Lake Park in the northern part of Saskatchewan, that there were many, many submissions, not to allow alcohol into the park. I think those who suggest that public opinion wants all of these things are certainly out of tune with public opinion in my area at least. They may be expressing their area's concern, but not mine.

I am also very doubtful of the value in selling beer and wine from grocery stores. I am concerned because I saw what happened to this in Quebec. We were told in Hull, Quebec, that

April 6, 1973

in that city alone there were some 600 of these so-called grocery stores selling beer. It was quite apparent that there was that number, there were about three or four in every block. I was not impressed by their selection of groceries, as you might believe. We went and visited an independent kind of supermarket and as we went by the checkout counter, they had beer stacked up by the checkout counters like it was a special in butter and they were pushing it.

This again, is their merchandising mentality and those who know Quebec will know that it has a very high alcoholism rate and you will also know that some 75 per cent of the alcohol consumed in Quebec is in the form of beer, not wine. I thought they followed the French tradition, but they don't. I believe that this very easy access would not be good. I would add a caveat to this, that perhaps if the alcohol content could be greatly reduced and the price increased, then it might make some sense. At this present moment I can't support this.

I think the Committee had some wisdom in suggesting that if this was going to be proceeded with, that it be proceeded with in a pilot project area and that we have scientific research of the results of this kind of change. As I say, if it is going to be proceeded with, that kind of approach seems to be rational and reasonable.

I question the value of licenced outlets on the University campuses. As long as we see things such as I read in a recent article in the Carillon, of the students council there promoting the pub crawl which they call CHIT, which just symbolizes all of the very worst elements of alcohol abuse in our society. This is overconsumption in an attempt to view it with humor rather than as a pathological situation. I think that in the future this might be studied, but recent evidence has sort of swung my mind the other way on this.

I doubt the value of the recommendation on obsolete hotels if it tends to replace a poor hotel, with no hotel at all. I do not think a tavern offering no accommodation and with meals as a side line, is desirable. I think what is more desirable in that kind of situation is a restaurant having a dining room licence or a licence to serve beer or wine with meals. That kind of situation makes more sense to me than going into the American pattern tavern. I don't know how it would be administered to have hotels with licences in some areas and taverns in other areas.

I don't want to go on into any greater length on parts of the report I don't agree with. I think the report is a valuable one and this is the feedback, in general, that I have had from the public. I think that with some 4,000 copies already distributed throughout Saskatchewan, the large scale public discussion on this, the Government would be well advised to wait, listen and judge the situation according to the public mind.

I am aware that some of the recommendations, in regard to prevention, will not necessarily gain public acceptance without public education. But I believe that the Government has the responsibility to educate the people of our society as to the extent of alcohol abuse. I think that we are heading for what some people have called a chemophylic society. This is a society of people who must have some chemical in their blood

stream to live.

I have recently read a report in regard to education in Alberta and they indicated that this is what they saw coming in our society. More and more drugs, and they indicated that as present trends probably would continue to the end of the century, the one drug that is most abused would continue to be alcohol.

It is my strong feeling that that is not the kind of society that I want to see. It is my feeling that the people of this province and Canada, if they are given the information, will, in fact, choose against that kind of society. I am aware that there are tremendous pressures in this direction. I am aware that no simple negative kind of attitude is going to stop that kind of thing. We have to wrestle with the problem of developing a positive and meaningful pattern of life for people both as individuals and as a society. This is a responsibility that by no means falls only upon legislators. It is historically, of course, the responsibility of such institutions as churches, which have maintained the values of our society throughout generations. But altogether all of our institutions, the churches, the schools, the means of government, all have a total responsibility in a total situation which I think proves dangerous to us.

I am very pleased to have the opportunity to present this report. I hope that it will receive considerable debate from Members on both sides of the House and I hope that Members on both sides of the House will feel free to present their convictions.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, we just heard a very sanctimonious speech from the Member. For a moment there he implied, or at least he left the impression with me, that the Press had discussed this report and he brought some humor into it, and he left the impression with me that all Press men were indulging in alcohol and I am not aware of that.

Another thing that disturbs me a little is the Member who has submitted this report, Dr. Faris. I should have liked to see him not be the chairman of this Committee. I think the position that he holds with the church, it has taken away some dignity from that position. He might have been better off trying to convince people from the pulpit rather than be on a committee, trying to find out what all the problems are.

There are a lot of things that I can agree with him on his submission and there are a few things that I can agree with in the report. But if the report is adopted, that certainly will open up an area of abuse and use of alcohol the like of which we have not seen on the North American Continent.

The Member from Arm River (Mr. Faris) said and emphasized education and rehabilitation. Well, I would emphasize education before the use of alcohol, because he admitted that only five per cent of the people that are alcoholics can be helped. And alcoholics cannot really be helped unless they choose to be helped. There is no way in which to convince an alcoholic that he needs help until he finds out for himself and he wants that kind of help.

April 6, 1973

Today, I heard on the radio this morning, that one million gallons of alcohol are drunk every day in Canada. They are talking about the welfare program and talking about welfare on every part of the continent. And the reason that we have so much welfare is alcohol. Alcohol is problem number one. And if the minister of the cloth was sincere that alcohol is problem number one, I would just like to question his sincerity when he supported the Age of Majority Bill last year by reducing the drinking age to 18, opening it up for another group that wasn't there before.

When he talks about all the things that are recommended and included in this report, he is responsible for it, then I should like to know whether he supports the opening up of drinking permits in nursing homes. I see in his report that he did not mention the University campuses that should have liquor outlets. From the correspondences that he has received I suppose that he is now opposed to giving special permits for liquor at the University campuses.

The consumption of liquor in private offices, and he mentioned this. He is opposed to it now and he doesn't mention that in his minority report. The consumption of liquor at park sites and camp sites I think that this is something that we should look very, very closely at. I am glad that he mentioned that he is not in favor of it. Hospitality rooms, the report recommends that hospitality rooms be given licences, private halls, club functions on Sundays. One thing that I have to disagree with is that today he says that people, couples or families, are drinking together with their children and that he would not be opposed to families entering a licensed premise with dining facilities, and have their children drink with them.

Surely if the children are not allowed in these premises, all the more reason why these families should not, or heads of the families, should not walk into these places.

And married minors. If you marry a girl who is 16 years of age and you happen to be 18, that the 16-year old wife could go and drink. I think one of the best briefs that was presented to the Commission, comes from the New Democratic Party organization at La Ronge.

I have a copy of it, perhaps I might even have the main copy of it and I want to read some of the articles that are contained in this copy. It is signed by the NDP organization Mr. Ryhorchuk of La Ronge. And some of the statements made in this brief I certainly would have to agree with. I want to read a good portion of it for the edification of the Members opposite, just to prove to you that even there are a lot of members in the NDP that do not agree with what was submitted. It goes on to say, on page 2:

In some cases it seems it has been necessary to actually throw patrons out onto the street or driveway. Once off the licensee's premises these patrons become the responsibility of the community. Then our police and welfare agencies are obligated to step in and look after another family.

Now when we talk about La Ronge we immediately think about native people. I don't want to throw anything against the native people. The native people are just as bad as the whites.

The whites are not one bit better. And when it comes to the number of people I suppose there are just as many whites in this category as there are native people, although the percentage among the native people could be much higher. The report goes on to say:

It was possible that the waiter was under some pressure to sell more liquor.

From whom? From the Liquor Board, or maybe from the Government.

The bartender under pressure from the manager, and the manager in turn under pressure to maintain sales volume and improve the profits for the licensed owners. The finger is pointed on the welfare recipient. The community pays the costs of the consequences and the licensee reaps the profits for the sale of liquor.

And who reaps the profits? The Government is, opening up more and more places of liquor and extending it to more and more people. On page 4 the report goes on to say:

The welfare recipient and the liquor problem. It has been suggested many times to cut them off liquor, off the welfare rolls.

Well, this is what should be done. If you drink you shouldn't have welfare. I don't mind, and I don't think there is a person in Canada, nor in the world, who doesn't want to help people that are needy, but I don't believe that a person who is on welfare should drink or smoke, because they are both needless. Absolutely needless. I won't buy liquor for my children and I can afford it. Why should I go and buy liquor for people who are on welfare, who leave perhaps 75 to 90 per cent of their payroll in the beer parlour?

This is what the report says, this is what the NDP say.

What is the answer? We really cannot see, however, there appears to be some strong relationship between drinking alcoholic beverages and the people on welfare.

I should like to have these remarks directed straight to the Minister of Welfare. This is the problem. You get those people off of welfare and you will also get them off the drinking. That is problem number one.

What about the Government and liquor? On page four, item six, this report from the NDP organization says:

Looking over the Liquor Board financial statement for the year ending December 1970, we find a net profit exceeding \$25 million and last year's profit was closer to \$30 million. Obviously the very real reason for being involved is this source of revenue. Could this be the reason that the Government quietly allows large volume outlets to be granted a monopoly of positions like large dealers who keep up the sales volume, which in turn keeps the revenue coming in. So why change the dealership setup?

This is the question that they are asking.

Now on the back of the NDP report there is a letter from a

April 6, 1973

school teacher which has been attached to the brief, which the Liquor Commission has heard. I want to read the total letter and I am sure that the lady's letter, Evelyn C. Lindgren, who wrote it, is public information and I want to put this letter on the record of this House. And this is what she says on page 6:

Observations of a classroom teacher, La Ronge.

If this doesn't open up the eyes of every Member in this House, and if it does, this report is going to be rejected by every Member and I don't care whether you are a teetotaler or whether you indulge.

Evelyn Lindgren goes on to say:

Over the past seven years as classroom teacher I have experienced times to treasure and times of futility. The purpose of this paper is not to analyze why, but to state facts as I see them. Many of the children that I teach are from poverty stricken homes. As a result of their socio-economic deprivation psychologists validate that these children cannot expect to be competitive scholastically. They are nearly all Treaty children. The rest have a Y number (meaning welfare). They are underfed, unclean and ill-clad.

I am not saying this, this is what was reported by the NDP organization.

Today 30 per cent came in with no lunch. Last week one tiny girl covered with sores was requested by the nurse to stay home. Today another one of my students was requested to stay home until he was free of head sores as he was a danger to the health of the classroom. This description of a few incidents is not unusual in La Ronge. I conferred with other teachers on staff and they had come from South End, LaLoche, Ile-a-La-Crosse and Red Earth. They all agreed that at no place where they had been was there such apparent neglect of children. We noticed these as regular behavior.

I want the Attorney General to notice this item which he points out.

1. After allowance cheques, that is welfare cheques or any moneys received, our classroom attendance is very low.

Why?

2. Those who come are without lunch and often fall asleep during the day.

3. A child having missed school will report, "Mamma slept." (During the day and not at night.) Outside the classroom and in my own home after allowance day the night is filled with crying voices, quarrelling voices. I am safe and warm but my conscience is not.

She writes:

This pattern of life perpetuating and engulfing all within the culture of poverty is an unjust legacy for the next generation. It has been said that the Indian demands

a high degree of emotional control and that they have accepted drinking as a permissible outlet for frustration and hostility. If this is true then it is a sad society that allows its children to live in neglect.

And the signature is Evelyn C. Lindgren.

This is one of the most damaging reports that I have read since I have been a Member of this Legislature and it really spells out exactly what I have said over the years. And yet we as legislators go from one step to another. Where is our conscience? Have we got any at all? Here we have a report. It's huge with many recommendations. What about the recommendations? Rehabilitation after the fellow has been impaired or is a drunkard or an alcoholic. It's no use working with him after. You've got to work with him before. Once he becomes an alcoholic you might as well write him off. I don't know whether it's worth spending millions and billions of dollars trying to rehabilitate five per cent of the alcoholics. I always think about the time when Christ was on earth, the Jews didn't accept him and some say Christ loved everyone. You know, Christ said to the Jews, "I tried to gather you like a hen trying to gather her chicks," and he wrote them off. Yes, he wrote them off. And maybe we should write off this five per cent. Maybe we should write off this five per cent and put every dollar into education before these children and young people get the taste of alcohol. That's where the dollar would be far more wisely spent. Because we are going to come to the time when \$88 million spent on welfare, and if I was a betting man I would bet my farm that \$66 million of it ends up in the beer parlour.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I must criticize the cost and the fanfare of this Commission. The taxpayer must be made aware that this Government believes in travelling at all costs and this Committee is no exception. Let's look at the Eastern tour. If you want to look at liquor, how they consume it, you know they drink it out of a glass, you don't have to go to Quebec to see how they do it. The Members who went along, Mr. Brockelbank, Mr. Faris, the Member from Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) — I don't know how to pronounce his name he should change it to Boldt — it would be a lot easier; Thibault, Whelan. This Committee first went to Toronto and I imagine that they went by plane, first to Toronto to find out how the people drink in Toronto. Well, they drink out of a glass there too. They've got alcoholics there just as well as we have here. You don't have to go to Toronto, you can go to La Ronge. You could even go to the town of Warman. You could go to Saskatoon. You don't have to go to Toronto. Then I suppose they went over to Ottawa, Hull and they went over to New York City at public expense, Chicago and Winnipeg. Tremendous trip! I wish I could have been favored with a trip like that but not on that Committee.

The Western tour by Members, Kwasnica, Feschuk, Gardner, McIsaac, Lange and MacDonald. This Committee travelled first to Edmonton, Vancouver, Seattle, Victoria, Salt Lake City, Great Falls and Calgary. I suppose they found that liquor was sold in bottles or tin cans and it was drunk out of glasses as well as they do it out here. I suppose they also found that there were many alcoholics in those provinces and states as we have out here. And I suppose they also found out that in those states and provinces that alcohol was the number one problem and it will remain so for a long, long time. Indeed, this Committee reported on page 16, that the most commonly abused drug,

April 6, 1973

and the Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris) reiterated this, in our society is alcohol. They also state that this is confirmed by the LeDain Commission. All you have to do is read the LeDain Commission and save tens of thousands of dollars that this trip has cost. What has this Committee gained by the tour that could not have been gathered from the Report of the LeDain Commission or the little bit of research that would have been necessary within the boundaries of Saskatchewan.

I have come to the conclusion that this was just a glorified holiday trip at public expense to justify maybe in some way or another to the public that MLAs can be kept busy and that they should be well paid. They have formed the opinion that 80 per cent of the adult population consumes alcohol. This proportion they state has increased dramatically particularly amongst our young people. They had to go to New York to find that out. Is it any surprise why this Government, if they are so concerned particularly about our young people, why in the world would you give it to the 18-year olds. Tell me! Why?

Mr. Cody: — You voted for it.

Mr. Boldt: — You voted for it. I didn't vote for it. You don't know what you are talking about. Either you are not sober or you don't know what you are talking about. You'd better have another drink.

This Committee recognizes on page 17 of the report that there is a very wide use of alcohol in Saskatchewan and that the use is increasing. Sure they recognize it. They also say that the number of people abusing alcohol in Saskatchewan is increasing. They didn't find that out in New York. They didn't have to find that out in Toronto. I suppose they found that out in Saskatchewan and that's where the Committee should have stayed and saved some money. No need to go on two world tours to find out what's happening in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Feduniak: — They're old enough to join the army.

Mr. Boldt: — Oh, they're not old enough to join the Army. That's a very weak argument. Nobody can tell me that an 18-year old is ready to join the Army. You take the 30-year olds and there would have been no war in Vietnam, I can tell you that. The 18-year old is a very easy follower. Anybody can pick them up. They have no responsibility and this is the sad part of Government. The 18-year olds, that's a very, very poor argument. The 18-year old isn't fit to go in the beer parlour and in many cases he isn't fit to sit behind the wheel. I have come to the conclusion that this was just a glorified holiday trip. This is really what surprised me. When they are so concerned about the 18-year old, that this Government brought in a Bill last year, the age of majority, to reduce it to 18, and I wouldn't be a bit surprised that with the fuzzy thinking you have in your front benches you'll bring in a Bill to reduce it to 16.

Mr. Feduniak: — 19-year olds, you brought that in.

Mr. Boldt: — Yes, I was opposed to that

too. This Committee recognizes on page 17 of the report that they know there is a very wide use of alcohol in Saskatchewan and it is increasing. On page 19 the report states:

While the present level of alcohol is alarming, what is even worse is that it has been and continues to increase.

I suppose they found that out in New York. So in view of this alarming trend what is the Liquor Committee recommending, to curtail the use of liquor? If this is all that alarming, if this is terrible, let me point out some of the most objectionable recommendations as I see them and there are many more. But I will list just a few. If this Committee really was alarmed at what was happening would they be recommending the establishing of a licensed outlet operated by the Students' Union at the Saskatoon and Regina Campuses? You know, the professors and teachers can hardly control those students when they are sober. How in the world are they going to control them when they're not — and since the introduction of the 18-year olds, teacher after teacher in Saskatoon have told me that they have sent home drunken kids at nine o'clock in the morning and this has never happened before. This even happens in the school at Osler.

Mr. Rolfes: — Will you give me the names?

Mr. Boldt: — I'll give them to you in confidence. I certainly will. The proposed legislation is amended to allow minors in the company of their parents or guardians to consume beverage alcohol with meals and licensed dining rooms. In other words, you've got to train them early. You've got to give them drink early. Give them drink while in the crib, maybe in the bottle so that when they grow up they'll become real good alcoholics so that we can spend some of our profits from the Liquor Board to try and rehabilitate them. It just doesn't make sense. It's just another incentive for the young people to drink.

They also go on to recommend that the Saskatchewan Liquor Licensing Commission at its discretion may allow the sale and consumption of beer at sports events at special designated areas. That's a dandy, I'm telling you. You've got to mix sport with liquor. Well, sports and liquor don't mix any more than liquor and gas do. I can tell you that. Here is where you are going to expose the young people. The sports days are designed and designated by schools for our young people. So you are going to open the eyes of the young people and show how drunkards behave on sports days. It's a shame.

Here is another recommendation aimed at discouraging minors not to drink, and I quote from the report:

That present legislation be amended to allow legally married persons under legal age . . .

That means under 18. You are already recommending this under 18.

. . . to consume liquor in licensed premises when in the company of her spouse who is of legal age.

Well, if it's against the law for a 16 or 17-year old to enter a beer parlour, married or not, that should have no difference. The law is for everybody, not just for a few.

April 6, 1973

I find it difficult to discover the reason why the Committee would recommend that licensed premises be available for infrequent staff functions to be held on Sundays. On Sundays and on holidays subject to approval by the Liquor Licensing Commission.

Here is one I believe will certainly be welcomed by the Attorney General:

The Committee recommends that legislation be amended to allow the consumption of beverage alcohol in a vehicle by individuals of legal age other than the driver.

Can you imagine a car having six people in it, one driver, five people drinking, getting all lit up, and that the driver will not want to have a drink? So if he wants to drink he can have a drink but he would have to exchange the wheel with somebody who is already impaired. It just doesn't make sense. I can imagine all kinds of things that will happen if a group of people go on a drunk trip. Even if the driver refrains from drinking and remains sober, what will the other five do? Get a hold of the wheel and say that I can drive better than the sober man? The cost of the Automobile Accident Insurance Fund increased last year and it is going to continue to increase if this is the kind of legislation we as responsible people want to bring in. It is a terrible thing to do. Then the licence plates go up and we don't know why. The Attorney General knows why. Because of the 18-year olds entering the beer parlour for the first time. We have an increase in accidents and an increase in deaths that we haven't had since the last four or five years.

Mr. Cody: — You are wrong.

Mr. Boldt: — How do you know I am wrong?

Mr. Cody: — Because of the statistics.

Mr. Boldt: — You haven't got any statistics. I asked for them and you said you couldn't get them. I have only mentioned a few of the most repulsive recommendations of the report. If all of the recommendations were implemented that are recommended then Saskatchewan would be branded as the alcoholic state of the North American continent. It's really a wonder that our Committee didn't recommend that our rivers, lakes and creeks and well water be replaced with beer, wine and alcohol. I am very interested in how the Members opposite will vote on this report and particularly the Members of the clergy on your side of the House. The Member from Saskatoon Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes), the Member from Notukeu-Willow Bunch (Mr. Engel) and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood).

I want to commend Dr. Faris, John Gardner, Cy Macdonald and Don McPherson for spelling out some of their reservations about the report which you will find in the last pages. I hope that these Members will be able to convince the socialists that some recommendations ought not to be implemented. Much of the report is positive as I said in my opening remarks, particularly in the field of education and I can support some of the recommendations. For instance, the report recommends against liquor advertising. I am worried about that one. It won't take two years and you will have liquor advertising because you've got to have some income. It recommends community education and it

emphasizes rehabilitation and I want to say this. I recommend community education before rehabilitation is necessary. We all know that the cost of alcohol in dollars and cents and misery and broken homes and vehicle accidents, loss of work, just can't be measured. The important step to take is to prevent its use, like a stitch in time saves nine. I believe the Government and the Committee in particular are on very thin ice and they should be very careful on the promotion and availability of liquor to the public and particularly to our young people. And certainly I would want to add that it should be denied to all those people that are on welfare.

We call ourselves a civilized nation and many of us would like others to believe that we are also a Christian nation. To those that believe that we are Christians, I would like to, and I don't want to preach to you gentlemen, but I want to say this, to those who want to call themselves Christians, I would ask you to read from Prophet Habakkuk, chapter two, verse 15, and I quote:

Woe onto him that giveth his neighbor drink.

And in some translations 'woe' means perish.

That putteth thy bottle to him, and maketh him drunken and also that then thou mayest look on their nakedness.

The Government that will do what it recommends by the Commission will surely perish. There is no argument about it.

I want to record my objections to the majority of the Commission's recommendations.

Mr. Engel: — On page 97 of the report you indicated that you agreed with the recommendation to allow for advertising of liquor, is that true?

Mr. Boldt: — I recommended what?

Mr. Engel: — You said that you appreciated the recommendation of the Members, and you named Mr. McPherson and he recommends on page 97 4(a) that they advertise liquor in our magazines, television, radio and . . .

Mr. Boldt: — I said I was opposed to it.

Mr. Engel: — You didn't say that. But I am glad you cleared that up, Sir.

Mr. Boldt: — I want to make it clear that I said there were some reservations and I commended those who made them but I was also opposed to the advertising.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.M. McPherson (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I think since the Liquor Report has been introduced this afternoon, we have had the Member from Rosthern

April 6, 1973

(Mr. Boldt) giving us a lot of food for thought, to the Member from Arm River (Mr. Faris), and to this House, Mr. Speaker.

I want to say that there was a lot in this report that the Members will certainly be speaking on on this side of the House and I know on the other. It is a report where there will be no political sides taken. I feel that every Member is going to have an opportunity to speak on the report and say whether they agree with it or not. With that, Mr. Speaker, we have had a busy week and it will give every one a chance to take the report home and study it. I know the Member from Rosthern will be glad to help any of you who want any advice on how to write the report and with that, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

INTERIM REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS FIRMS

Mr. A.W. Engel (Notukeu-Willow Bunch) moved, seconded by Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden) that the Interim Report of the Special Committee on Business Firms be now concurred in.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to address this House today as chairman of the Special Committee on Business Firms. At the outset I should like to thank our staff for the work they have done, particularly Mr. Barnhart and Mrs. Harbottle. I just have one comment that I thought I should like to share with the Members here and I thought it was worth repeating.

Last year, while we were planning our Committee work, Mrs. Harbottle had been assigned to the job of working with our Committee. One morning at 7:30 in the morning she called me to the 'phone and we spoke for about one-half hour on the work of the Committee and regarding advertising, etc. After I hung up and had a coffee with my wife, she said: "How come she 'phoned you that early?" I said, "Well, she is getting married today." I think it was a tremendous commendation for the interest she had in the work, the dedication she had, and her writing ability. I should highly like to commend her at this time.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Engel: — I, too, should like to thank the Committee members who served on this Committee and for the co-operation they gave. The background and the knowledge that these people had really qualified them to cope with this kind of work and I should like to thank them for the work they have done on this Committee as well.

Then the past week, as I was listening to the debate in this House, Mr. Speaker, I want to say I was really encouraged in having taken up the task of this Committee and this work of the Business Committee. One of the things that really thrilled me and really encouraged me and gave me this new enthusiasm was the attitude and this change that we can expect from our Members opposite. They have indicated that they are going to support the Committee work and get behind this Committee and work at it with new vigor and a new spirit. The principle of committee work, going to people, hearing the problems and then sitting

down and deciding to write a report is a really valid principle. The idea that we, as backbenchers, and Members opposite can sit down together and write a report that would change the base of business in Saskatchewan is a real challenge to me. But, when I saw the final draft, or the proof of the printers, of this report, I was really discouraged. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the reservations were a blow that I just didn't expect. I will be referring to some of the problems we faced and some of the things that took place while we were preparing and working on the Committee's interim report.

One of the first problems that we had was the timing of the hearings. We wanted to get the best results from the businessmen of Saskatchewan and we wanted to get them at a time when they had time to speak with us and also when they were at home. So we decided that July would be a very bad month to have hearings, after that you get into the harvest season and that makes it really difficult. So we postponed the hearings and tried to pick a time between harvest and Christmas. We were all set, we came into Regina and we agreed on a schedule and this was when we were going to have hearings and something happened in Ottawa that we felt made quite a difference. Trudeau decided to call a Federal election. We had scheduled our advertising and it was ready to be released. I called in and I was informed that I had one-half day or so to decide whether we were going to postpone this advertising or not. To try and catch some of the members on our steering committee and other members was just about an impossibility because the election had already been announced and some of the Members were already organized and out campaigning. I was unable to reach all the members. I did talk to some of our own members and I reached this decision on my own and decided to postpone our hearings for one month. I made that decision on the basis that I didn't want this Committee report to be political. I didn't want to be accused because we had such a large majority. There are five members on our side for every federal constituency, whereas on the other side they are about one to one. I just didn't want to take unfair advantage of the situation. So I decided to postpone the hearings. But if you will look at your report on page 7, those of you that have it in front of you, at a meeting of the Committee on September 25th our Member opposite from Lumsden (Mr. Lane) submitted his resignation as a member of the steering committee. He did this because his argument at that time was that I had postponed those hearings. If you will look at the rest of this report, Mr. Speaker, and I will get to the reservations a little later, you will see why the Member resigned.

Now as to the content of the report you all have the copies before you. We made some general observations at the beginning. The first observation is that this report basically deals with the thinking that the business community felt. We also mentioned that the Committee feels that these areas deserve further study and investigation. Although these are not the only areas of concern, the Committee wishes to outline some of the problems that the business community stressed. These are not necessarily the problems that we, as Members, say; we tried to spell them out under seven headings, according to the general concern that was indicated.

We ranged rather widely in this report, particularly the members on our side, and I am grateful for their co-operation in attempting to get a unanimous report, because it is an

interim report, because it is a report we felt the business community is asking for. We weren't making any specific recommendations as such, so that we could come up with an interim report that would say to Saskatchewan businessmen that we had sat down together, two Members of the Opposition, five from this side, and we had listened to the problems that they faced and this is how we spelled them out. But it just didn't come out that well, there had to be some reservations. And why do you suppose there was a reservation? We talked about tourism, services, transportation and freight rates, innovations, research and information. I should just like to mention here that some of the work that the Saskatchewan Research Council is doing is just tremendous and they gave us very good information. Employment and training programs, we printed here exactly the way we heard it and we have listed some other recommendations. Some of these things the Government is already beginning to act on.

Now if you look at the appendix you will see that we had a large number of people appear before our meetings. We had very good support from the business community. That is the one point that I should like to make regarding the content of this report, and why we possibly might expect that there could be some politicking. That support was the one reason we got this politicking while we were out on the hustings and while we were out visiting the various towns. We didn't make copies available of our verbatim reports, but I was reading just the other day, and I thought I would make a copy of that, Mr. Speaker, and on page 23 and 24 of the hearings that were held in Lloydminster on November 14th, the Member from Lumsden asked this question:

Could I just raise one other piece of legislation (and I am quoting word for word) and I refer to the Department of Consumer Affairs and the power of the Government to close you down for five days and I am referring to the Provincial Government legislation. Will that have any effect on you?

Now we were listening to a very good brief. This brief was being presented — and I am sure the man won't mind me mentioning his name — Mr. Doucette. He is a manager of a business that has a service station and a car wash. He is a manager of a lumber yard, of a feed mill, of a bulk oil place, a grocery store, a clothing department, a hardware department, a furniture department and a drug store, and this man was asked:

Could I raise one other question, if the Government would close you down for five days, will that have any effect on you?

Mr. Lane: — Was that a co-op store?

Mr. Engel: — That was a co-op store. Maybe Mr. Lane wouldn't have asked that question if he had known it was a co-op store, but the answer was — and I thought this was really good. I read through the whole report and none of us made a comment on that, nobody else made a comment on that particular question. Other times we maybe had more discussion on that same question when it was raised. And the question I should like to ask, that I have looked up since in Hansard: How come that Member supported that piece of legislation and voted for it? This is what really floored me. But the answer was really cute and I think the

Members here will really be interested in the answer and I am quoting:

I am not fully aware of that. I am aware of some others that are coming at us from the West.

He was aware of some problems he was getting from the Conservatives but this 5-day closure didn't scare him one little bit. The kind of politicking that was going on at the meetings was really rough on a rookie member. I was interested in keeping this Committee going together. I don't say that I really lost some sleep about it, but it was difficult to cope with politicking and obstruction while we had a job to do. We had people that were anxious to co-operate. 275 presented briefs; there were over 80 more who appeared in person without a written brief. We had tremendous support for this kind of a thing. In Committee work you can get through work more expeditiously and at less cost than where five or six members by debate hold up the work of the Legislature.

Now in the reservations and the priorities established to the Committee were, number one, you will find that on page 11 under Section 2. Number two, he makes another reservation that more flexibility should be implemented as to the hours of work. If you look at page 12 of this report under Section 6, that particular reservation is spelled out. If you look at number three, if you turn to page 10 under item 1, that was our first priority as far as a change in regulations allowing our public highways a more adequate designation. He is wasting space here and using things that have already been said. The fourth reservation he makes and says, an improvement in the total transportation structure in Saskatchewan under Section 4, pages 11 and 12, we dealt with that very topic. What I am trying to say is that, why couldn't we, when we had the opportunity here, we heard a problem, together we could have taken the credit for saying that we want to solve this problem, but they had to throw a road block in the way, trying to undermine the work of the Committee.

I was really anxious to write a report that would make sure that would assure these businessmen. Here we have a list that takes in just about every main street in Saskatchewan and this is what I think our Members opposite were really worried about. They have indicated exactly where they stand by their actions.

Then there is one other thing I should like to refer to at the very beginning, back at page 7, there is another date there on Thursday, January 18th, and we had a very talented young man for a research assistant. I want to commend him and put it in the record that I appreciated his work. But this research assistant also submitted his resignation on January 18th, 1973 and I wondered why he did that. I think basically he did it because the chairman was too soft and was too anxious to get a unanimous consent from the members of the Committee. We changed the style and the approach and the tactics we were going to use as far as drawing up our recommendations about three or four times and finally he wrote this letter:

I must tell you that I find myself in severe disagreement with the Committee's decision regarding the form and content of the interim report.

He finally gave up and said, "I've had enough. I am not

April 6, 1973

rewriting this, I am not going through all those books again,” and I don’t really blame him. We expected too much.

Now that we have heard two hours of talk in here that the Members opposite are anxious, and they believe in the committee system, and as I said at the start, I am really enthused to go back to work. The Opposition Members have had one change of heart, has changed completely and has said, “I believe in this thing. I am anxious to go back,” and so I am sure we can go back to the business community, we can come up with a final report that will change the direction of business in Saskatchewan. I am sure that in a wealthy province as we have here that there is room for business expansion, there is tremendous expansion potential, if this potential is harnessed and directed properly.

With these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I should like to move a motion, seconded by Mr. Lane (Lumsden):

That the interim report on the Special Committee on Business Firms be now received.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. B.M. Dyck (Saskatoon City Park): — Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am amazed at the position taken by the Liberal Members of the Business Committee.

Firstly, about some of the comments that were made about committees in general in this House. Some of the Members were suggesting that committee members were taking financial advantage of the situation of various committees that were in operation and they were, in fact, somewhat critical of the committee approach.

Secondly, I am amazed at the reservations that were added to the report by the Liberal Members of the Business Committee.

Somehow they must have felt it incumbent upon themselves to disagree, not because there was any basis for disagreements, but because in their opinion, not to disagree would be tantamount to admitting the success of the Committee, which it undoubtedly was.

Let us look at their first reservation. Does it make any reference to the report proper? No. Does it make any reference to what the business people were telling us? No. Rather it makes reference to remarks made by the Minister of Finance in his Budget address.

They couldn’t criticize the report directly. They didn’t find anything there to say, except to comment on a remark of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley).

Maybe I can understand why the Members of the Opposition made such remarks. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that they at no time had any faith in this committee approach. Their record of attendance at the hearings is a good indication of their feelings with respect to this Committee. Had they attended more of the public hearings maybe their attitude would have changed.

I submit that contrary to and in spite of the Liberal

Members of the Committee, the business people all over this province were happy, were encouraged and were enthusiastic about their opportunity to voice their opinion on problems and prospects of business in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Volumes and briefs and oral presentations attest to this fact. I can understand why they would greet this opportunity with some enthusiasm. Because under the previous administration this opportunity was never available to them. This opportunity was not available to them because the leaders of the party opposite preferred the comforts of a large corporate board room in Eastern Canada or in the United States rather than the offices of the Saskatchewan businessmen.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dyck: — I submit that of all the many failures of the former Government this failure to assist, to help, to develop the small and medium sized business firm was the most glaring.

Now may I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the day is gone where a businessman may make a decision to open up a fabricating plant for, say, heating equipment or a grocery store or whatever, and reasonably expect to be in operation in a relatively short period of time. This is not the case today, Mr. Speaker.

Business is much more competitive than it was in the past. Business is much more complicated. Markets today are usually more than just the local markets. The market for a product could now involve the whole province or the whole prairie region or all of Canada. Or even various parts of the world. For these reasons most business decisions require study and research and planning. And there weren't very many services available to the business community through the previous Department of Industry and Commerce.

In their reservations the Liberal Members mentioned that the establishment of a field representative to provide advice and assistance on management problems was not a high priority among the business people. However, it was clear from the many briefs that we received that business people wanted to know more about regulations concerning federal and provincial incentive programs, labor regulations, more information on credit and markets and a variety of other data that they wished to have at their disposal.

It was very clear that they wished to have some assistance provided to them in these areas. When we responded to this by asking whether or not they would agree with a management advisory service, many, many of the business people indicated in the affirmative. So again, contrary to the reservations on this report, Mr. Speaker, I believe the business community do wish to have these services at their disposal.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dyck: — I have said on other occasions, Mr. Speaker, that one of the major challenges to the present administration of this province is the development of industry. And as Members of this House are aware of the development of industry in Saskatchewan is not an easy task. Our proximity to markets, the matter of

April 6, 1973

inequitable transportation rates, our relatively sparse and scattered population does not lend itself to easy development of industry. But nevertheless, I am confident that this Government is and will be taking up this challenge. And I think the working of this Committee is an integral part of this development.

In ending, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out, I was very disturbed by all the comments that were made in this House about the Committee approach. I think it was unfortunate, regrettable and the Members opposite are going to have to assume the responsibility for these remarks.

Mr. Speaker, Members of this House will appreciate that the Business Committee postponed its hearings in September and October to November and December. And essentially this was done because of the Federal election which, in our opinion, we thought would jeopardize the hearings. As a result in the delay of the hearings and the early calling of the Session, it was extremely difficult for this Committee to put together their report in time. Because of these and other problems there were some delays but nevertheless, this exercise was a worthwhile exercise. It was a worthwhile exercise because for once, the small and medium size business firms of this province were involved. For once the small and medium size business firms were given some consideration. I think the small and medium size businessman has a place and a role in the development of our economy in Saskatchewan. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:00 o'clock p.m.